Volume IV Number 1

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1927

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREPARING FOR LEADERSHIP IN WORSHIP. Luther D. Reed 5

THEOLOGICAL CURRICULA AND DEGREES. Frank Grant Lewis 21

EXPERIMENTAL CHRISTIANITY AND RIVAL RELIGIONS. Ralph W. Nelson 38

THE PLACE OF "RELIGIOUS EDUCATION" IN PREPARING FOR CHURCH ADMINISTRATION. Stewart G. Cole 52

AN ANABAPTIST POET AND DREAMER. Bertha W. Clark 76

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

NOTES ON THE FOURTH CENTURY CHURCH OF NISIBIS (MESOPOTAMIA). A Study of Early Oriental Church Polity. John Crosby 84

SOME TRADITIONAL MISINTERPRETATIONS. E. B. Pollard 92

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

SOME ELEMENTS OF POWER IN THE PREACHING OF GEORGE W. TRUETT. L. O. Dawson 95

THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR W. R. NEWBOLD. M. S. Enslin 97

WHAT'S WHAT IN THE MAGAZINES

THE CHRISTIAN TRAINING OF THE EMOTIONAL LIFE 99

TEACHING RELIGION BY PROJECT 100

THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN RELIGION 102

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE 104

BOOK REVIEWS 106

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *by*

THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free

330836

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is issued by the Faculty of the Crozer Theological Seminary with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees at the annual meeting in May, 1923.

The scope of THE QUARTERLY embraces all the departments of instruction in the Seminary. Each professor is responsible only for the contributed material and for book-reviews signed by him, but he may publish such articles contributed by others as may be appropriate to his department, without however incurring responsibility for opinions expressed therein.

The aim of THE QUARTERLY is to familiarize the reader with results of investigation in Biblical and historical and theological subjects pertinent to a curriculum in a theological seminary, and also to be a medium by which pastors busily engaged in the ordinary work of a pastorate, may communicate to fellow pastors the results of reading and experience and reflection on subjects on which they are specially qualified to write. From time to time THE QUARTERLY will present surveys of recent literature in various fields of theological learning.

Remittances and communications should be addressed to

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHESTER, PA.

PRINTED BY
THE JUDSON PRESS
PHILADELPHIA

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, January, 1927, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. IV JANUARY, 1927 No. 1

PREPARING FOR LEADERSHIP IN WORSHIP

Professor LUTHER D. REED

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Pennsylvania

THE devotional life of the church is the church's effort to realize its ideal of communion, the communion of redeemed souls with their God, and the communion of spiritually minded men with each other. It is therefore fundamental to any adequate conception of religion or of the church.

It is not so much the root or the stalk as the flower of Christian life, the ultimate expression in forms of spirituality and beauty of the church's noblest gifts and powers. Yet it is more than this. It is a means of edification, education, and spiritual development. Liturgies, hymns, and cathedrals are more than momentary expressions; they preserve; they are the bearers of great ideas from century to century; they have a quickening power that is new for every age; they impress and inspire as well as express; they witness while they worship; they preach while they pray.

The historical interest of the subject is overshadowed by its present practical considerations. With problems much the same in essential character, but yet fresh in every place and for every group, the subject of Christian worship probably

absorbs more thought, practical energy, and wealth the world over than does any other department of the church's activity. The fundamental necessity of providing times and places and the material of worship draws every congregation, and every believer in each, into practical contacts with this subject.

It would be difficult for a Professor of Liturgics to restrict a treatment of "training in worship" to practical exercises. For Christian worship, while an act of a particular congregation or group at a particular time, is a permanent unbroken function of the church, indissolubly associated with its life. It has a history, a theory, a literature, as well as a practise. There is material and there is spirit, as well as method to be mastered.

It may be well to develop this idea further. Suppose we think of worship under the figure of a temple erected and maintained by the church. The active, constructive principle which fashions the building will presumably seek to secure proper proportions and to promote the proper purposes of the edifice.

Proportion is a fundamental quality of design and is more important than detail. The first dimension that determines proportion is length, or—if we are viewing the edifice from the front—depth. It is because of their "shallowness" that so many structures of modern thought and life are unsatisfactory. We seem at times to be living in a veritable "Flatland," which knows but two dimensions. There is little perspective to our thinking. History is a blur and a bore; the future, somebody else's concern. The movie screen, with its thin, enameled surface, reflecting innumerable impressions with incredible rapidity and retaining none, seems a fitting symbol of our time. Our current literature is frankly superficial; our current art is flat and impressionistic; our current music has lost depth of feeling and reverts to elemental noise and rhythm; our education spins fine, psychological theories and offers shallower and shallower courses.

Nor are even the great institutions of society exempt. The State, the family, and the Church have suffered much from forces that care little for the past and less for the future.

This is not a wail of despair, it is a recognition of facts and forces that spiritually minded men must face and fight. We must bestir ourselves within the church and without. Just as patriotism must be rooted in a historic background of depth to be sound and strong, so love and loyalty to the church can best be promoted by intelligent appreciation of its long history and development. Public worship, with its detachment from secular motives and material, and its elements of spiritual power and universal appeal, affords the church one of its best opportunities to cultivate such appreciations. The members of the liturgical churches, as they use their historic forms, to the perfecting of which devout men of every nation and every century have contributed, must be measurably impressed with the depth of Christian thought and feeling, the length of Christian history and experience they represent. But every communion, however free its services, has a body of usage and tradition which connects it with the past; its gospel and its sacraments carry it back through the centuries; its hymns call up the figures of departed authors, valiant saints of other times; its music, its architecture, its art of whatever kind, flower out of stalks centuries old.

The second dimension is breadth. All public worship implies fellowship, common prayer, a congregational service. Coleridge in the " Ancient Mariner " says:

> O sweeter than the marriage-feast,
> 'Tis sweeter far to me,
> To walk together to the kirk
> With a goodly company:
> To walk together to the kirk,
> And all together pray,
> While each to his great Father bends,
> Old men and babes and loving friends
> And youths and maidens gay.

But the idea of worship soon expands beyond this and brings with it a broader conception of the church. The local group begins to exercise a " conscious fellowship " with other members of the Body of Christ when it adopts common forms of service, or enters into other common traditions of worship. Congregational self-sufficiency gives way to churchly consciousness.

The third dimension is height. Public worship must be maintained upon levels of solemnity, dignity, and spirituality. Communions which do not regularly use a full liturgy occasionally employ extracts from historic forms. The Preface in the Holy Communion, " a form of sound words " almost as ancient and universal as Scripture itself, is thus known in all the churches.

> Lift up your hearts:
> *We lift them up unto the Lord.*
>
> Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God:
> *It is meet and right so to do.*
>
> It is truly meet, right and salutary that we should at all times and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.
> *Therefore with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee and saying: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth; Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory; Hosanna in the highest.*

It is difficult to understand how any individual minister, priest or bishop, however gifted, however inspired by a particular occasion, could hope to secure such a sublime sense of height by words so few, and to sustain the effect service after service, year after year, by any utterance of his own.

But however realized, whether by the use of historic forms or by the exercise of personal gifts of spiritual insight, exalted thought, and imaginative fervor, this dimension of height must be secured or the temple of worship will be deficient in proportion.

Coming now to the proper purposes of worship, I mention, among others, edification, adoration, celebration, education, evangelization, and glorification. A word as to each.

Edification supplies an objective, sacramental foundation. It seeks improvement of the mind, strengthening of moral purpose, cultivation of spiritual power, ennoblement, and inspiration by the use of means committed to the church. Edification is promoted negatively by guarding worship from all that is distracting, irrelevant, and irreverent, unworthy, or of uncertain value, by protecting worshipers from the crude vagaries of individualists and the unedifying experiments of sensationalists. It is promoted positively by providing for the use of the means of grace in fullest measure, by building thought upon thought, precept upon precept from the Word of God, by providing for frequent administration of the sacrament, and by enveloping every hour of worship with an atmosphere of reverence, propriety, and spiritual vitality.

Adoration is more than a personal act. The desire to humble oneself before God, to commune with him, to pour out our souls before him, is an instinctive impulse of the individual. But it is best realized in fellowship with one's brethren in a devotional atmosphere. The individual soul may long to sing:

> We praise Thee, O God: we acknowledge Thee to be the Lord.
> All the earth doth worship Thee: the Father everlasting.
> To Thee all angels cry aloud: the heavens and all the powers therein.
> To Thee cherubim and seraphim continually do cry.
> Holy, Holy, Holy: Lord God of Sabaoth.

But the individual is not likely to sing this or even to say this at home, or alone, or with others in secular places.

Whether it be the thought of the *Confiteor* or of the *Te Deum* that surges within our hearts, it will come to happiest and fullest expression in a holy place, at a holy hour, and in fellowship with holy men. Because, as Doctor Vogt says, " Religion is an experience of divinity before it becomes righteousness," we must seek to provide the atmosphere of reverence and devotion and rigorously exclude noisy vulgarities, suggestive of worldly associations, which shock our spiritual selves into silence.

Adoration readily flowers into *celebration,* a natural result of focusing the devotion of many upon a common theme. The festival element is a feature of all religion. Men have ever elevated certain days and occasions above the dead level of the ordinary. The Lord's Day, no less than Easter, was from the beginning the celebration of the Resurrection. Every observance of the Lord's Supper is a celebration as well as an administration. The church year, whether with simple or elaborate calendar, is the outworking of this idea of celebration in worship.

Evangelization is another purpose of worship. Every beautiful church edifice, every dignified and reverent service, every Christian festival proclaims the gospel to those outside the churches as well as to those within them. Reverence, sincerity, and beauty in worship often appeal more strongly to outsiders than do the noisy efforts of professional evangelists. We may think it necessary—I wonder whether we are not sometimes mistaken—to go after the " down and outs " with bass drums and cymbals. But let us remember that there is an ever-increasing host of " ups and outs " who have nothing but contempt for such expressions of religion, and who will never be won to Christianity by such methods. Most of these can be impressed by the dignified presentation of Christian truth in a reverent service.

Another purpose is *education.* I am not thinking now of the part that preaching of breadth and high intelligence

may properly have in informing and instructing, as well as edifying, our congregations, but rather of the opportunity that lies in worship itself for grounding the youth of the church in fundamental Biblical facts and principles. It is not sufficient for our children to be born within the church. They must be bred up in it. Nor may this duty be left for others.

In the early church adult converts were only "admitted into the fellowship of Christ's Religion" after prolonged instruction. The Creed and the Lord's Prayer, which were among the earliest "forms of sound words" committed to them, soon became embedded in the structure of the liturgy to be used regularly by all groups of Christians in public worship. The medieval church employed an elaborate symbolism that was as wide-spread as Christianity itself, and that embraced every detail of worship as well as of the architecture and ornament of the church building, to teach Bible stories and the church's doctrine to young and old alike.

Luther and Melanchthon, both able teachers, fully appreciated the pedagogical values in public worship, whether conducted in Latin as in the schools, or in the vernacular for the masses. In fact, we may justly criticize these reformers for their overemphasis of pedagogical possibilities at the expense of devotional character of worship. We, however, are in danger of undervaluing the educational possibilities enfolded in public worship. For here, in the simplest, most natural manner, frequently and regularly repeated, are unfolded large portions of Scripture and material immediately based upon it. The Word of God is always powerful, but embodied in devotional form it is mighty. A simple but effective symbolism in architecture, ornament, stained glass, and even the service itself, adds its suggestive power, while memory and association prolong these influences down to old age.

The final purpose of worship is difficult to express in a word; I call it *glorification*. By this I mean artistic illustration, or exemplification of religious ideas in one or other of

the forms which satisfy esthetic feeling. Our appreciation of the beautiful is so closely connected with our appreciation of the true and of the good, that men have always tried to express religious ideas in beautiful forms, in immediate connection with places and times and the order of worship. Della Seta in his "Religion and Art" makes the sweeping assertion that "Art will never arise and develop among men unless it has a foundation in religion." There is no question that the art of the old world that attracts us most—Greek temples and statuary, Italian paintings, the supreme expressions in architecture, the mosaics of Venice and Ravenna, the wood-carving of Amiens and Rothenburg, the glass of Chartres—have all been called forth by religion. Every church or cathedral is dedicated "to the glory of God" and becomes a natural center for other works of art similarly dedicated. The bare fabric of a building is enriched with appropriate detail, sculpture and painting adorn it, music and ceremonial elaborate the festival services held within it. Divorced from faith this would be mere esthetics. Inspired by faith it becomes magnification, glorification, Christian art.

Most Protestant communions are now led by a reawakened appreciation of beauty to at least experimental observance of festivals and seasons, and a limited use of liturgical forms. Pioneer conditions and limitations are giving way before the advance of general education, culture, wealth, and refinement. The development of our cities, with their city planning, notable architecture, art galleries, and exhibitions, musical organizations, popular courses in literature and art, etc.—all this is effecting profound changes in our church life. The desire for beauty is bringing many face to face with the liturgical principle, which has ever welcomed the ministry of art, realizing that worship is an all-inclusive experience, and that adequate expression of it must be in forms of beauty as well as of truth and goodness.

If what has already been said is in any sense an adequate

characterization of worship, an indication of its proper proportions and purpose—what is the responsibility of the seminary for training in this subject?

I have examined the current catalogs of twenty-two seminaries in the United States. Apparently the only seminaries that have a department specifically devoted to worship, and employing the full time of a professor, are Hartford, Philadelphia Divinity School, and the Lutheran Seminary at Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

Practically all seminaries give at least one or two semester hours in the curriculum to the subject of worship. Some presumably provide additional training in worship in connection with exercises in preaching.

Five seminaries stand out beyond the rest in the attention given liturgies as such; Hartford, which offers four semester hours; Mt. Airy, six hours; General Theological Seminary, New York, seven; Union, eight; and the Divinity School, Philadelphia, sixteen.

Hymnology is taught in seven seminaries in courses of one or two semester hours. Church Music receives fair attention. Practically every seminary offers something, and at least seven institutions offer four hours or more.

In Church Architecture, Hartford and Mt. Airy are the only seminaries that offer courses. In Church Art, Mt. Airy offers six hours elective work, and Gettysburg offers a one-hour course.

Comparison with catalogs of fifteen years ago shows that the seminaries are giving Liturgics and related subjects considerably more attention than formerly, but it would seem that the importance of the subject is still underestimated by the seminaries as a whole. Much of the diversity disclosed is due to different conditions in liturgical and non-liturgical churches. Some institutions provide little more than the practical exercises which the chapel services afford, evidently depending upon the future practical experience of their students to develop

powers of leadership in this field without theoretical or historical foundations. Others, while doing more than this, still do not appreciate the fact that the subject is capable of scientific development.

The seminary will not realize its full responsibility by providing mere training in worship, if by training is meant nothing more than practical exercises. There is a theory, a history, a literature of worship as truly as there is of homiletics or of missions, and there is far more scientific material which should be presented and mastered than there is in some other practical subjects which usually receive greater attention in the curricula.

The manner of worship of the different churches will largely determine the measure of recognition which this subject should receive. Churches with a historic liturgy will naturally give particular attention to it, its backgrounds, its doctrinal and devotional content, and its proper performance. But this alone will be but a narrow and shallow treatment of the subject as a whole. All communions—whether liturgical or non-liturgical—should give instruction in the nature of worship as such, in the classic liturgical expressions of the Universal Church, in fundamental conceptions of Christian art, particularly church architecture, church music, hymnology, etc., as well as drilling them in conducting the services according to the usages of their own body.

A program that will be possible of anything like universal application is not to be expected. Perhaps, however, I may be permitted to indicate what my own seminary is doing.

Fifteen years ago the Philadelphia Seminary established a Department of Liturgics and Church Art. We plan endeavors to give all the subjects embraced within the field of worship something like scientific treatment, as well as to establish a lofty idealism which will inspire the church of the future to intelligent service and worthy achievement in its devotional life.

The curriculum provides prescribed courses, elective courses, and elective seminar courses, the latter open to students whose grades are 85 or more. The prescribed courses cover fundamental material and change but little. As typical of the work of the department I will mention the courses offered last year. In Liturgics proper; a one-hour prescribed course for Juniors on "The History of Christian Worship"; a two-hour prescribed course for Juniors on "Introduction to the Liturgy" (of the Lutheran Church); a one-hour prescribed course for seniors on "The Occasional Services (Baptism, Confirmation, Burial, Marriage, etc.) and the Usages of the Church"; a two-hour elective course on "Worship in the Different Churches." In the latter course the official forms of other churches are studied in a comparative way, and students are encouraged to attend representative services in other communions.

In Hymnology, Church Music, and Church Architecture one-hour prescribed courses are given. In Church Art there was a two-hour elective course on "Introduction to Church Art" (illustrated); an elective seminar on "Symbolism in Christian Art and Worship"; and an elective seminar on "Great Religious Paintings and their Meaning." Altogether the department offered seven semester hours of prescribed work, four semester hours of elective courses, and four semester hours of elective seminar courses.

A second responsibility of the department is that of providing for the daily services. The professor in charge is the chaplain of the seminary. So far as possible the effort is made to realize in the daily services the church's devotional ideals and to make its authorized forms of worship real, attractive, and powerful. The chaplain organizes and directs the choir, which is chosen by "try-outs" much as in the case of a college glee club. Two student organists, each receiving a small stipend, regularly officiate. The services are conducted by the students themselves. A sacristan from the Middle

Class and an assistant from the Junior Class serve for one week each, and make all necessary preparations.

Certain wider responsibilities also center in the department, and project the influence of the seminary. The professor in charge is naturally expected to do what he can to develop the literature of subjects within his field, and is also called upon to give much time and labor on general committees of the church in the preparations of the church's service-books, hymnals, and devotional literature. In constant touch with all parts of the church, with a wide and unprovincial outlook, the department becomes, in many respects, a clearing-house for practical problems; a center welcoming information; constantly studying and analyzing the life of the church as well as the culture of the day; endeavoring to apply the best in current science and art to the requirements of the church, while safeguarding the permanent and spiritual principles and the distinctive and characteristic expressions of the latter.

Because the seminaries, if not always the leaders, eventually become the interpreters of important movements within the churches, we may conclude this paper with a glance at present-day tendencies in the field of worship.

It may be well to stress the fact that Liturgics is not a subdivision of archæology. It is a practical science which springs from the living present. The name of one of the liturgical books of the Greek Orthodox Church, "The Book of Needs," is very suggestive. We may well believe that the great bulk of Christendom employs fixed forms in its worship, not because of the power of a deadly tradition, but because liturgical order and its expressions in church art satisfy its real desire. The Roman Church continues the Mass and the Divine Office, maintaining its Congregation of Sacred Rites to supervise their every detail, because these services express its faith and life. The Anglican Church has scarcely changed its Prayer Book for 300 years, because, broadly speaking, it has been suited, though revisions now approaching completion both

in England and the United States witness to reactionary preferences on the one hand and the desire for greater flexibility and freedom on the other. The Lutheran Church, with a liturgy more flexible and responsive to changing conditions than the Roman or the Anglican, is in this country steadily solidifying its forces with general Anglicization, and unifying its worship along conservative, churchly lines.

Among groups that have been consistently known as non-liturgical Churches ever since the Reformation, there are many evidences of awakened appreciation of liturgical order and church art. Beginning some years ago as a tendency of individual leaders here and there, this has acquired the breadth and momentum of a movement. Dr. Van Ogden Vogt, in his recent work "Art and Religion," constructively suggests a program which includes simpler, nobler, and more beautiful church buildings in churchly style, with chancels and altars, or communion tables, centrally placed; a liturgical order rich in historical elements; the celebration of important festivals; employment of pure church art in every form; the maintenance of open churches for prayer and meditation, etc.

The echoes of the article on "The Menace of the Sermon," by Dr. Francis E. Clark, founder of the Y. P. S. C. E., first published in the *Yale Review* (1922) and quoted around the world, are still reverberating. He said:

> There is but one way to fill our churches with men and women and to keep them full. They must be filled first with the spirit of worship.

Until recently the chancel was practically unknown outside of the Roman, Anglican, Lutheran, and to a less extent, the Reformed Churches. But within the past decade or two fully fifty important churches, some of them among the finest in America, have been built with chancels by Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Universalists, and Unitarians. Many of these have altars, others, beautiful communion tables, centrally placed. Occasionally there are crosses

and even candles upon them. It is more than interesting to know that the Methodist Church has established a Board of Architecture in Philadelphia, maintaining it with an annual appropriation of $22,000. This is lifting the standard of church building in that communion beyond belief. Many of their newer churches are built with chancels, pulpits, lecterns, and choir stalls, and Doctor Conover of this Board has recently appealed directly to the companies that manufacture and install church furniture to use their influence to discourage certain unchurchly features, e. g., circular pews, opera chairs for the choir, reading desks instead of pulpits, etc.

Reference should also be made to the Book of Common Worship, a rich collection (262 pp.) of liturgical forms prepared by a committee (Dr. Henry Van Dyke, chairman) of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and issued " for voluntary use." Similar forms are widely used in Congregational circles.

Last summer I worshiped in the " King's Weigh House Chapel," London, England, where Dr. William E. Orchard, a Congregationalist minister and perhaps the ablest preacher in London today, is conducting a remarkable experiment. His church has an altar with cross and candles, he wears simple vestments, administers the communion frequently, and regularly conducts a series of liturgical services of incredible fulness and variety, much of the material being based upon forms in the Missal and Breviary of the Roman Church, the liturgical books of the Eastern Church, and other historic sources, with original material of his own.

On the other side of the shield we may note the evident desire of leaders within the liturgical churches for greater freedom and flexibility. This is evident in the very suggestive Report of the Archbishops' Committee of Inquiry Concerning the Worship of the Church, 1918, and in such recent discussions as Percy Dearmer's " The Art of Public Worship," 1919. Within the Lutheran Church, both in this country and in

Europe, particularly in the great cities, there is a movement to supplement the regular services of the Church with evangelistic services of a freer type.

These movements disclose growing appreciations and sympathetic understandings throughout the church as a whole. In them, as in other respects, we are endeavoring to discover solid ground for a common footing, and are often surprised to find unexpected unity amid diversity. We shall do well if our non-liturgical groups lead their students to a critical and yet devout study of the great historic liturgies and of the history and literature of the entire field of worship; and if the liturgical churches give more attention to the psychology of worship and the manner of worship in other communions than their own, and also train their students to conduct a free service as well as to read their own liturgy. Let us stress our common possessions, in our hymnals, public orders of service, etc., while cherishing and cultivating our really important and distinctive developments.

We sadly need a comprehensive study of Christian worship as a whole. There are plenty of books which discuss the Greek, Roman, Anglican, and Lutheran liturgies in detail, but none which grasps the entire field with breadth and thoroughness. We also need a thoroughgoing study of the theory and the psychology of worship, based upon broad knowledge. Dean Sperry, of Harvard Divinity School, has broken the ground for this in his recent thoughtful book on " Reality in Worship."

The present age rightly impresses the claims of missions, education, and social service upon the church, but these, like every other practical duty, can only be rightfully fulfilled by the church as it keeps its heart strong for service in a deeply spiritual, devotional life. The latter, intelligently and consciously expressing the faith of the church, is the church's innermost strength. Christian worship and Christian work must go together. Both develop from Christian faith, and these three—faith, worship, and work—together form the

wonderful common chord of the Christian life. Faith is the tonic, giving fundamental tone and character. Worship is the third, now in major, now in minor mood, as the heart sweeps through the inexhaustible range of promise and prayer. Work is the fifth, giving completeness to the chord. Together they express the Christian life in its fulness, certainty, strength, and beauty.

THEOLOGICAL CURRICULA AND DEGREES[1]

Librarian FRANK GRANT LEWIS
Crozer Theological Seminary

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, in his volume entitled "Theological Education in America," published in 1924, has furnished a cross-section of theological curricula and degrees in America at the present time. This work of Doctor Kelly is highly important. Nothing similar had been attempted previously, and there is little occasion for a volume of similar import to be prepared for some time to come. The volume supplies a study of the general condition as well as the courses of study and conditions of graduation for one hundred and sixty-one theological schools in the United States and Canada. The significance of such a study can hardly be overestimated and its value has been widely recognized accordingly.

Significant as the work of Doctor Kelly is in itself, it is no less significant, and in some respects perhaps more significant, when it is considered in view of the theological development which has led up to the present and furnishes the foundations for that which now exists. Such an introduction was naturally enough no part of the purpose of Doctor Kelly in the splendid survey which he produced. The subject, however, is one which during recent decades has become increasingly interesting to students of education. It had happened to be a topic of large interest to me for a considerable period prior to the appearance of Doctor Kelly's work. The occasion which brings us together has seemed to be a suitable moment for offering such an outline, primarily for its own sake rather than as an introduction to the work of Doctor Kelly, and yet possessing the essential relationship which I have already indicated.

It would not be unnatural to think of a theological semi-

[1] Matriculation Address, Crozer Theological Seminary, September 21, 1926.

nary as a quite modern institution. As a matter of fact, however, such a conception of theological schools would be misleading. Indeed the real foundations of current theological training lie as far back as the twelfth century. Anything like a complete history of that theological training obviously would require a volume larger than the work of Doctor Kelly. Naturally no full history is thought of for this paper. Indeed the essentials of the historical development, from the point of view of the principles of theological education, may be gathered within brief compass. The purpose in hand, accordingly, is to start at the beginning, but to deal only with the controlling elements of the growth which has brought us to the present time.

To understand merely the theological side of the history of educational development, however, it is essential to recall so moot a fact as that the literary language of the twelfth century was Latin. It is from the Latin language that we receive our most familiar current terms in theological discipline. We must keep in mind also that universities in general, and theological education in particular, began merely as a unit of students and teachers, without endowments, without boards of trustees, and without buildings except such as were improvised by the academic community to meet its needs. So definitely was this the situation that a university, that is, a group of teachers and students, might decide over the week-end to move from one city to another, and in the new location continue their work to a better advantage than in the old.

Professor Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard, in his little volume "The Rise of Universities," has so admirably stated the situation that I quote at some length. He says:

> Historically, the word university has no connection with the Universe or the universality of learning; it denotes only the totality of a group, whether of barbers, carpenters, or students did not matter. The students of Bologna organized such a university first as a means of protection against the townspeople, for the price of rooms and necessaries rose

rapidly with the crowd of new tenants and consumers, and the individual student was helpless against such profiteering. United, the students could bring the town to terms by the threat of departure as a body, secession, for the university, having no buildings, was free to move, and there are many historic examples of such migrations. Better rent one's rooms for less than not rent them at all, and so the student organizations secured the power to fix the prices of lodgings and books through their representatives.

Victorious over the townsmen, the students turned on "their other enemies, the professors." Here the threat was a collective boycott, and as the masters lived at first wholly on the fees of their pupils, this threat was equally effective. The professor was put under bond to live up to a minute set of regulations which guaranteed his students the worth of the money paid by each. We read in the earliest statutes (1317) that a professor might not be absent without leave, even a single day, and if he desired to leave town he had to make a deposit to insure his return. If he failed to secure an audience of five for a regular lecture, he was fined as if absent. . . He must begin with the bell and quit within one minute after the next bell. He was not allowed to skip a chapter in his commentary or postpone a difficulty to the end of the hour, and he was obliged to cover ground systematically, so much in each specific term of the year. No one might spend the whole year on introduction and bibliography! (P. 14, 15.)

Such action on the part of the students with its evident success reveals a thoroughly united movement on the part of all of them. The natural Latin word for such a union was *universitas,* and therein lies the beginning of a university and one of its historical elements, a theological school.

Remembering that the teachers in that early university life were men who had undertaken individually and privately to give instruction for tuition fees, it is easy to see that the instructors were at once placed at a serious disadvantage when the students had combined. What the instructors did under the circumstances is most happily expressed by Professor Haskins, and I quote again:

Excluded from the "universities" of students, the professors also formed a gild or "college," requiring for admission thereto certain qualifications which were ascertained by examination, so that no student could

enter save by the gild's consent. And, inasmuch as ability to teach a subject is a good test of knowing it, the student came to seek the professor's license as a certificate of attainment, regardless of his future career. This certificate, the license to teach, thus became the earliest form of academic degree. Our higher degrees still preserve this tradition in the words master and doctor, originally synonymous, while the French even have a *license* at the present time. (P. 16, 17.)

Out of such humble beginnings came the custom of conferring the degree of Master and the degree of Doctor, in theology as well as in the other arts.

Out of these same beginnings but reaching back into still simpler customs came the degree of Bachelor. Already prior to the beginning of university and theological life there were, of course, crafts, trades, arts, these terms being equivalent. As a university developed in a town where these arts were well established the two naturally came into close relationship and eventually the arts schools were absorbed in the university organization.

As a part of this development the word Bachelor (Latin, *Baccalaureus*) came into use describing the status of an initiate into work which might lead later to a Mastership or Doctorate. Just what was the origin of this Latin word for Bachelor is not certain and for the purpose in hand does not matter. It is sufficient here to have in mind that it came to be a distinguishing mark in student life, indicating the initial stage of work which might naturally lead to academic recognition. A student who had become a Bachelor might then go on later to become a Master, that is, one qualified to direct educational work, or a Doctor, this term indicating a status equivalent to that of Master but applied more especially in the realm of law, medicine, and theology.[2]

As a further indication of the slow development of courses of study and the degree marks for graduation, it is sufficient to note that fixed examinations for the degree of

[2] See S. S. Laurie, "Rise and Constitution of Universities," pp. 218-222; Gabriel Compayré, "Abelard and the Origin and Early History of Universities," pp. 149-152.

Bachelor seem not to have been given until the fifteenth century, about three hundred years having passed to bring about what seems to us such a simple incident in the academic field.

The system of university courses of study, examinations and degrees having been established, the next significant step from the point of view of theological development is one which did not belong to university life itself. On the contrary it was an element in the religious and theological views of the period. Those views included the idea that ministers of Christianity are a separate and priestly class, a class into which a man enters through ordination at the hands of his priestly predecessors, as a result of which he is no longer merely an ordinary man. Several centuries of ecclesiastical unfolding from the primitive days of Christianity had established this idea in ways which are familiar to students of history. The idea still maintains itself, of course, and is taken for granted in Christian communions where the priestly view of the ministry prevails, especially in the Roman Church.

The significance of this idea in the history of the growth of theological curricula and degrees is in what it brought about for preparing courses of study and degrees for men who were entering the ministerial calling. Assuming that the minister is a priest, a separate and superior class, it was natural that his course of study and his degree should recognize that distinction. In the course of time, therefore, it came about that the thoroughly equipped priest must be a man who after becoming a Bachelor of Arts and perhaps a Master of Arts, must continue theological studies until he should become a Bachelor of Divinity or a Doctor of Divinity, Master and Doctor in this field, as I have indicated, being essentially synonymous terms. Much the same was true for a physician, who, through popular usage, has come to be regularly called Doctor; and much the same development occurred in the case of the advanced student of law, especially canon law, so that Doctor of Law was a common title for a man of highest attainments in that field.

It should be mentioned that university life from the twelfth century on was by no means uniform in all the several centers of learning. On the contrary, a large element of variety existed in the several institutions, and the attainment of a degree meant more in some universities than it did in others. This was the case for theological courses of study and degrees as well as in general fields of academic life.

A real rebirth of learning had appeared, however, and the later portions of the Middle Ages were not on such a dead level of uniformity, at any rate in university towns, as is often thought to have been the case. In this respect the later decades of that period were somewhat more like the present as to mental promptings and expressions of intellectual life. It was this fact which brought about the Renaissance and paved the way for the Reformation, that period in the unfolding of Christianity which brought about the next essentially new step in theological teaching and in the marks of theological attainment.

Some elements of that academic growth up to the period of the Reformation deserve attention. On the Continent Paris became the outstanding center of university life and perhaps the leading place for theological study. There was very close relation, however, between Paris and Oxford, and the leaders at Oxford seem to have followed to a marked extent the courses of study and schemes of graduation which prevailed at Paris.[3] This factor in the history of theological education is particularly significant for the English-speaking world because of the prompting which Oxford naturally gave not only to Great Britain but across the Atlantic into America.

In this development one may naturally be interested in the contents of the course of theological study at Paris and their relation to the underlying studies of university life. For a summary of the situation I quote again from Rashdall:

[3] See Hastings Rashdall, "The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages," vol. 2, pp. 440, 441.

The theological student passed the first six years of his course as a simple auditor. For four years he attended lectures on the Bible, for two years on the sentences of Peter the Lombard, these being the only text-books with which the theological doctor necessarily became acquainted during the whole of his fifteen or sixteen years of study. How completely the sentences were placed side by side with the Bible as the other source and foundation-head of all theology is illustrated by Albert the Great's disquisition on the knowledge possessed by the Mother of Christ. After demonstrating that the Jewish peasant-woman must have been acquainted with the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium,* the Doctor proceeds to discuss the extent of her attainments in the Faculties of Medicine, Civil and Canon Law, and Theology; in the latter he holds that she must have had a "summary" knowledge of the Bible and the Sentences.

At the end of these six years of study, provided he had attained the age of twenty-five, the student might appear before the Faculty with his certificates of due attendance on the prescribed lectures and supplicate for his first course. He was then examined by four Doctors, and if passed would be formally admitted by the Dean to the reading of his "first course," *i. e.,* be made a Bachelor. He entered upon his Baccalaureate by responding in a public lecture called a *principium* and then began a course of lectures on a book of the Bible, which occupied a year, and in the following year a second course on another book. . .

In the course of the ninth year of his study, the Bachelor was required to respond in a disputation known as the *Tentative,* at which a Master presided and assigned a question to be disputed upon while a number of Bachelors awaiting their license opposed the respondent's thesis, and afterwards conferred with the Master as to whether the exercise should be accepted by the Faculty. (Vol. I, pp. 464, 465.)

Rashdall reveals also both the relation between the course in arts and the course in theology up to the beginning of the Reformation. He says:

A student in arts would have been as little likely to read the Bible as he would be to dip into Justinian or Hippocrates. Much astonishment has sometimes been expressed at Luther's "discovery" of the Bible at the convent library at Erfurt. The real explanation of his previous ignorance of its contents is that Luther entered the Order a Master of Arts but had never studied in a theological faculty. Even the educated secular priest who was not a theologian or at least a canonist, was not supposed to know anything of the Bible but what was contained in his Missal and his Breviary. (Vol. II, p. 701.)

The separateness of the theological discipline from the general course of study and the assumed superiority of theology over other academic disciplines with the developed relationship between the degree of Master of Arts and the degree of Bachelor of Divinity are amply shown in Oxford records also, and illustrate the line of thought here presented. The first stage in theological discipline at Oxford, called Opponency, that is, the ability to conduct a discussion, required for Master of Arts candidates four or five years of study, apparently divided between the Bible and the Sentences. If, then, one wished to continue and secure the Bachelor of Divinity degree, he must study two years more, that is, seven in all. In case the student had not pursued his preliminary work so as to become a Master of Arts and, afterwards, a Bachelor of Divinity, the requirements were still more extended, in order that eventually he might be supposed to have reached equivalent attainments. If, after he completed his Bachelor of Divinity work, he then pursued theological study two years longer, he might receive the *license,* in the attainment of which he should have lectured on one book of the Bible and on the Sentences, should have presented an examinatory sermon at St. Mary's Church, should have conducted eight discussions with non-graduate students, and have disputed formally with other Regents at the University.

One sees at once the significance of such a course of study and the resulting degrees. The purpose of the study was not to search for new material in the field of religious life or to investigate into the history of Christianity. The materials of religious education seem to have been regarded as already fully at hand. The aim of the course was to have the student memorize, or otherwise become familiar with, the material as it was previously assumed, and then to develop in him the capacity for handling that material in dialectical fashion, equipping him to present the contents of his education in its most logical and compelling form, enabling him to surpass any

antagonist in the field, both by his knowledge of the assumed facts and his ability to handle them successfully.

It is easy to see that such academic procedure readily led to tests which sometimes involved the physical as well as the theological, as Rashdall further says:

> A certain amount of animal combativeness and physical endurance was almost as necessary in the "warfare of the schools" as in a tilt or a tournament. At this disputation known as the Sorbonic, from its taking place in the Hall of the Sorbonne, the respondent was required to reply standing, alone, and without the assistance of any Moderator or judge except an audience which occasionally signified its approbation or disapprobation by stamping or clapping to a succession of opponents who relieved each other at intervals from six in the morning till six in the evening, an hour's relaxation only being allowed for refreshment in the middle of the day. (Vol. I, p. 458.)

To be sure, a reading of the history indicates that sometimes these requirements became relaxed, and there are intimations that occasionally the supposed rigidity of the demands became somewhat farcical. Nevertheless it is easy to see why the system as a whole tended to produce formal logicians and systematizers of theological material, and had its fruit in the tomes of theological discussion bequeathed to us by the later Middle Ages, which today are a treasure-house for those who wish to become acquainted with the background of our theological inheritance.

Throughout the entire course of that academic life one of the factors of prime importance was the assumed superiority of theology as compared with other fields of study. This may be repeated in order to give it proper emphasis and attention for the later periods.

With that in mind we can see the substance of the situation so far as theological studies and degrees are concerned up to the sixteenth century and the beginning of the Reformation. One sees that the content of the curriculum in theology was almost exclusively formal rather than calculated to be

investigative, that the Sentences of Peter were regarded as basic in the course of study, that acquaintance with the Bible was rather secondary to familiarity with what Peter had given, and that the nature of the discipline was calculated to produce logicians, rather than historical scholars or practical Christian leaders from the standpoint of life in our time.

The work of the Reformers, especially Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and their associates, growing out of the revival of learning, placed primary emphasis upon the study of the Bible, including a study of its original languages. Hebrew and Greek, accordingly, came to be treated in the new movement as essential factors in theological training. Latin was not forgotten but rather reemphasized from a new point of view so that it should contribute to the use of Hebrew and Greek.

This departure from the idea of the Roman Church, however, did not include a departure from ecclesiastical dogmatism concerning church authorities. Luther and the others repudiated the authority of the Roman Church but transferred that authority to the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Also, while they were university men, they left behind the very spirit of university life, freedom of research, when they reached the Bible, their general attitude toward religious books involving this. Their attitude, however, did not seriously affect the essential element of university life and activities for others, namely, the element of freedom to think and carry the results of investigation to their natural conclusions.

Under such circumstances it was natural that university life did not satisfy the Protestant leaders any more than it satisfied the leaders of the Roman Church, though theological subjects were still included in the university courses of study and were pursued by students whose inclinations were of the more inclusive type. Under those conditions, the universities, with their devotion to philosophy and science, could not satisfy any of the church leaders, even though students of theology continued to frequent university halls and familiar-

ize themselves with religious thinking from the university point of view.

It is needful to take into account also for that period the so-called Pietism which was developing. The leaders who were impressed with that Pietistic spirit, like Spener, for example, even though they differed distinctly from both the Protestant leaders and the Catholic ecclesiastics, were as little satisfied with the university trained ministers as either the Protestants or Catholics. Rather they were less pleased with the educational situation and became the founders of a distinct separate theological seminary.

The earliest institution of this kind, with which we are so familiar in our day, seems to have been that organized, primarily under the influence of the Pietists, at Riddagshausen near Brunswick, Germany, which dates from the year 1690.[4] The purpose of the institution, naturally, was to stress those elements of academic discipline which seemed to the founders to be essential for a real education and at the same time to include a loyal adherence to what they regarded as the special requirements for religious leaders. The essentials of university life were left behind.

While the institution at Riddagshausen is counted as the first of the distinctly theological schools, it seems to have been that only incidentally. The atmosphere of the period was such as to produce similar schools for other Christian fellowships. The Protestant leaders, like the Pietists, found it natural to establish institutions of their own which should serve the ideas they regarded as indispensable. For the Catholics a similar step was inevitable. The Reformation had brought a really new institution—the modern theological school with all its essential elements. One may say further, that nothing really new in the principles underlying theological curricula and degrees has appeared in about two centuries.

If this statement seems startling it will nevertheless com-

[4] See New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, vol. 11, pp. 331-333.

mend itself as soon as the trend of events is considered. New subjects of study have been introduced, to be sure. Some of the disciplines of the beginning of the eighteenth century have been abandoned or greatly modified. The essential factors of the courses of study, however, have remained the same, and the scheme of degrees has tended to become fixed rather than modified. Dialectic debates have been almost forgotten. Pastoral theology under one term or another has received recognition. Most recently religious education in a variety of forms has been included in theological discipline. None of these changes, however, have altered the underlying ideas out of which the standard theological course of study comes or the degree of recognition which the completion of the course of study assures. The accepted standard of the highest type of theological education assumes now, as two centuries ago, that beneath it belongs a course of study leading to a Bachelor's Degree. The Degree of Bachelor of Divinity, or Bachelor of Theology, is assumed to rest on four years of recognized college discipline, closing satisfactorily with the attainment of a Bachelor standing. In theological institutions where such a standard is not observed, it is nevertheless recognized, and an approach to it is made as fully as circumstances permit.

Emphasis is placed upon what has just been said, in spite of the commonplace nature of the statement, in order to fix its meaning definitely. From one point of view the discussion might well be left here. The controlling elements of the history have been sketched. There is, however, another feature of the history as a whole which has not been touched and yet one which is of no slight importance, particularly if we are to understand the theological situation of the present.

This further factor is the tendency of religious life and religious thought in general from the close of the Reformation to our time. When we consider the religious life and thought of these two centuries, it is easy to see that there have been changes of no slight moment. In the period of the Reforma-

tion it was tacitly assumed, even among Protestant bodies, that the ministry was a separate and superior class of persons. The Catholic Church has emphasized this. Most of the Protestants have assumed something of the same attitude of thought. Lutherans and Anglicans conscientiously retained the essentials of that point of view. The same idea with reference to a clergyman is widely taken for granted. This is obvious from the fact that the question of ministerial orders is one of the supreme obstacles in the way of Christian reunion at the beginning of the twentieth century.

That such is the situation emphasizes as strongly as need be, however, that another and entirely different view of the ministry has become recognized and accepted among a considerable proportion of Christian people. This different idea of the status of the Christian ministry regards it as democratic and non-priestly in contrast to the priestly view of the ministry which is held by the Catholics preeminently and by other Christian communions to a somewhat less degree. This non-priestly view of the ministry has developed through the growth of thought which leaves behind the idea that ordination to the Christian ministry produces in a person a superiority of religious character apart from the moral and spiritual character of the person. From this non-priestly point of view a minister of religion is primarily a man among men, different from his fellows in the fact that he has devoted himself to religious service rather than that through ordination he has been transferred into a special ecclesiastical caste.

This non-priestly conception of the ministry is an entirely natural outgrowth of the scientific and historical pursuits which have given us the modern university and so much of modern life. As one item in this unfolding, the office of the ministry has opened to many who can not at all qualify for the standards of the recognized theological seminary. One may agree without hesitation that this opening of the door of the ministry to those who are not regarded by others and do not

regard themselves as a priestly class, has its disadvantages. The situation as it is nevertheless is a fact and one of which we must take account.

From the non-priestly point of view of the minister, the best service is rendered by a religious leader who, like his fellows in other respects, is best prepared to guide them in their religious thinking according to tests of religious and moral conduct which commend themselves to the people in general in the same way in which they commend themselves to the religious leader. The thoughtful congregation regards itself fortunate if it has as a Christian minister a person who is as well qualified as most of his parishioners from the point of view of education, culture, and general understanding of the meaning and worth of life.

As has been indicated already the modern university is contributing very decidedly in the direction of furnishing such non-priestly religious leaders. In substance this is a sufficiently familiar idea in our day. The addition of Biblical and religious courses to university curricula further indicates the direction of much current thinking. The tendency is seen also in the matter of conferring degrees. Separate theological seminaries generally have not placed much stress upon the attainment of degrees, especially those beyond the Bachelor, until within recent years. The work of a seminary has been conceived primarily as that of preparing for pastoral service.

Coincident, however, with the increasing tendency of seminaries to affiliate with universities there has been a tendency to place greater emphasis upon theological degrees and to extend the idea so as to include a degree of Master in the field of theology in addition to the degree of Bachelor. Wherever this has developed, however, the Master's degree has assumed the previous attainment of a Bachelor of Divinity degree, and this has continued to assume a Bachelor of Arts, or equivalent attainment, as prior to theological study.

This familiar statement of the course of events in our own day is made, not for its own sake, to be sure, but rather as a basis for noting what the history suggests for the ministry, both for the priestly churches and for the preparation of a non-priestly ministry, a ministry which may be rightly called prophetic, embodying the permanent elements of the prophecy of the past and other elements which naturally inhere in a truly prophetic ministry for the present.

That teaching from the history of other days seems reasonably clear. It would appear to say that for the priestly churches a continuance of the ideas of theological curricula and theological degrees as they have developed and now maintain themselves, is natural and suitable. If a minister through ordination ceases to be an ordinary person and becomes a priest with priestly functions which cannot be exercised by other persons, then it is entirely normal that the course of study which he follows in preparation for his work should be distinctly different from that pursued by the members of his congregation. If, as a priest, he is of a superior caste in the community, then it is natural and obvious that the course of study which he pursues should be superior to that pursued by his fellows and that the Bachelor degree for him should be distinctive and recognized as being founded upon the Bachelor degree for the ordinary person.

The evident teaching of history for the non-priestly church and especially for its non-priestly minister is quite different. According to the indications of the history, the non-priestly minister will follow a course of study, from the close of what we call the high-school period, through four years of undergraduate discipline, in such a way that his special training will be in the field of religious life, religious thought, and religious service, a curriculum which will bring him at the end of four years of work to scholastic attainments equivalent for him to those reached by his companion in college work who looks to the field of science and receives a degree in science

thereby, or another companion who is particularly interested in the field of literature and receives a Bachelor degree accordingly.

At the present there is no recognized degree for such attainment in the field of religion. It cannot be simply Bachelor of Arts, for this term has lost its significance and has no specific meaning. If history could be audible, probably she would suggest the degree of Bachelor of Religion.

Precisely how history would have us work out the details of such a readjustment of training for a non-priestly ministry there is no occasion to undertake to say. Very likely indeed we should hesitate to listen if history could speak and voice what she has to offer, for one is reminded of what the poet-sage of New England, Sam Walter Foss, has so fully expressed in the closing stanza of his well-known idyl, " The Calf Path ":

> They follow in the beaten track,
> And out and in and forth and back,
> And still their devious course pursue,
> To keep the path as others do.
> They keep the path a sacred groove,
> Along which all their lives they move.
> And how the wise old wood-gods laugh
> Who saw the first primeval calf!
> Ah! many things this tale might teach—
> But I am not ordained to preach.

If, nevertheless, we should some time move in the direction of preparing theological curricula and degrees which would be a natural outcome of the non-priestly view of the ministry, it is not difficult to anticipate what would be the controlling principles of the curriculum, its main elements, and the degrees to which such a course would lead. A summary of the history has given us the essentials of such a development.

Since high-school training is everywhere assumed as the basis of our educational system, obviously a practical conception of a non-priestly religious leadership would regard gradu-

ation from a standard high school as imperative for the minister. Apparently, also, there would be added to that four years of training equivalent to the ordinary college course but including a considerable proportion of subjects dealing with religion, so that the studies of the course would suitably provide the elements of religious leadership and would be completed with a bachelor degree in religion. At the same time it seems clear that, while such a discipline would be essential for every one entering a religious ministry, and no one would be allowed to assume religious leadership without it, such a training for leadership in religion would be recognized as only a beginning in preparation for ministerial service, and a non-priestly system of ministerial training as a whole would assume a further course, probably two full years of study, leading to a Mastership in religion, the completion of which would prepare for actually efficient work. Even this, however, in view of our general educational standards at present, would not be thought of as the best preparation for a religious leader. Any one who would aspire to that position would continue a course of study, probably of two years, following the Mastership and leading to a Doctorate in religion. Less than such a general scheme history seems little disposed to recognize.

What the content of such an eight-year course following the high-school training should be, of what subjects or disciplines such a course should consist, history naturally does not indicate. Theological institutions have varied heretofore in the details of courses of study with apparently good results, and the same is likely to be true hereafter.

EXPERIMENTAL CHRISTIANITY AND RIVAL RELIGIONS

Professor RALPH W. NELSON
Department of Philosophy, Culver-Stockton College

I

THERE was no problem of rival religions a century ago. So long as Christians looked to traditional theology, with its formal logic, as the only technique required for the intellectual justification of their faith, their minds were prevented from seeing any real rivalry between Christianity and other religions. They were absolutely sure of the truth of their own position, from which certainty it followed that contrary views were necessarily false; a dogmatic attitude that led them into many tactless, not to say, unbrotherly, characterizations of non-Christian peoples.

The nature of this *certainty* is worth a brief examination. It is all too simple to pass the situation by with the cynical fling that it reveals only the unchristianity of Christians. On closer examination of the theology that Christians have inherited from their Augustinian and Calvinistic past, we find that the intellectual method, or logic, to which this theology appealed for substantiation of Christianity, was the Aristotelian logic of demonstration, which obviously necessitated the assumption of *truth known by somebody* before it could be demonstrated to others. Syllogistic reasoning cannot proceed at all without a major premise; and yet neither Aristotle nor his worthiest successor among Christian theologians, Thomas Aquinas, offers any device for testing the truth of major premises. From this it followed that the Aristotelian reasoner was *obliged* to hold his major premises *as true* whether or not he possessed any knowledge in this basic regard.

Naturally, then, for Christian reasoners, who, as a result

of the marriage of Christianity and the Neo-Platonic philosophy of Plotinus after the conversion of Constantine, found themselves heirs of both the moral program of Jesus and the intellectual method of Aristotle, it was not only inevitable, but it was altogether worthy on their part, that their *thinking* about the Christian way of life should be done in terms of the best intellectual method known to them. What, however, was to be the major premise upon which this Aristotelian presentation of Christianity was to be based? This query was answered by two words, *revealed truth;* a phrase that served at least partially to conceal the circular argument that God, the revealer, was known only through his revelation, and did not touch the question of how revealed truth, merely because it was revealed, could be presumed to be *known* by ecclesiastical leaders who had read what, in their judgment, purported to be a verbal statement of it.

In short, this presentation of Christianity is fallacious at its very core. It rests on a basic fallacy, against which Aristotelian logicians have themselves persistently warned their students: the fallacy of *petitio principii* or begging the question, which consists of smuggling into one's major premise the point to be established in his conclusion. How it comes that Aristotelian theologians should themselves be guilty of the very fallacy against which they watched most zealously is not so difficult a question as it at first appears. The danger points that fell beneath their watchful eyes were the relatively specific major premises dealing with this or that particular field. They had no technique for minutely examining, much less for eliminating fallacies from, such a general or even ultimate and metaphysical premise as that of truth said to be revealed to men by a supernatural God.

Among the basic questions of Christianity are assuredly those dealing with the existence of its God and of his relation to the world and to humankind; and *traditional theology begs all of these questions.* It simply *assumes dogmatically*—which

is totally different from assuming *hypothetically,* as we shall see—that God exists. That he has revealed his will to men, that this revelation is the Old and New Testaments (Roman Catholics would add: plus the equally inspired interpretations of the papacy), and that human beings are capable of receiving this divine revelation in such fashion as to keep it divinely infallible in spite of the admitted fallibility of human hands and heads—all these are propositions that traditional theology likewise accepts *as true; they are dogmas whose truth is begged from the outset;* in no sense are they hypotheses whose meaning and truth are yet to be verified in experience.

It is not fair, however, in pointing out the limitations of ancient logic, even to intimate that theologians of centuries ago should be reproached because they thought in the terms of their time rather than ours. Neither is it fair merely to blame Christians of our day and of the recent past for dogmatizing against other religions; for we see that their attitude on this point is directly traceable to the intellectual method they have inherited from ancient and medieval times. We can say, then, that any approach to the problem of rival religions, from which we might expect anything in the way of a workable solution of that problem, must rise entirely above considerations of praise or blame; and must turn its attention to an unbiased study of whatever questions may be found to be at issue in the respective claims of any and all religions. From the fact just noted, that it is the particular logic that Christianity has used for its intellectual justification since the time of Augustine, which is primarily responsible for the dogmatism of Christians as to the absolute truth of their own religion and the falsity of all rivals, we may conclude that logical principles, especially those dealing with basic assumptions, are among the first questions demanding examination. Perhaps we shall find also, that other religions have been no less dogmatically antagonistic to Christianity and to one another than Christianity has been to them; and that their dogmatism is likewise trace-

able to faulty logic. If this should be true, it might well clear the atmosphere on all horizons to introduce an *undogmatic logic*.

II

In the beginning of Christian missions among peoples like the Hindus and the Chinese, whose religions rest on foundations of civilizations of long standing, the missionaries played the rôle of strangers in the midst of cultures so sure of themselves as to render their leading votaries indifferent both to the Christians and their teaching. Consequently the missionaries were at first able to gain a hearing only from coolie classes whose members were in no real sense sharers of the cultures of their respective lands. These outcasts had no social standing to lose by accepting the new faith; neither had they the information or the training requisite to a defense of their ancestral religions capable of doing even partial justice to the claims of these religions. But with the passage of time and the gradual establishment of Christian churches among the lower classes, the missionaries succeeded in broadening the circle of their appeal until they were enabled to preach to the educated classes also. Here they were privileged to meet a most enlarging experience. These heirs of religions and civilizations in some cases older than those which the Christians themselves represented, and which had points that compared most favorably with certain phases of Christianity and Western civilization, were not content to be *preached to* by Christians. They insisted on preaching their own faith in turn.

I suspect that these initial engagements were mainly dogmatizing bouts in which there was no meeting of minds. Certainly the Christian missionaries were not prepared by their theological training to meet any one on any other ground than that provided by the *major premises* of their own position; and we have just seen how their logic compelled them to *beg* the matter-of-fact truth set forth in these premises. Hence

it was impossible for them to move forward to any concept whose inherent breadth might enable it to serve as a common meeting-ground[1] for those who disagree upon questions so fundamental as the existence or character of God. They could not say to their Eastern disputants, "Come, let us reason together," and mean by this invitation any other than what amounted to a dialectical trap; for he who thinks under the technique of Aristotle can mean by asking others to reason *with him* no more nor less than that they should accept, at least for that occasion, the major premises under which he thinks. Thus dogmatic, and utterly dogmatic, is the Aristotelian device of major premise.

The redeeming feature of this situation is the fact that few missionaries were trained formal logicians. Bad as was their logic, it was often transcended by their humanity. Nevertheless, the logic was there; no man escapes from the thought habits of his group. Dogmatic habits of thinking, and consequently of talking and dealing with their fellows, are assured to any people by the *mere absence* of one all-important element in their intellectual technique; namely, *a device for testing the truth of basic principles or assumptions.*

This enables me to correct an impression that the reader must have gained thus far; that I am making all too much of an intellectual scapegoat of Aristotle. It is only because he stands supreme among intellectual technicians that his name is a convenient symbol for designating certain characteristics of human thinking up till now. It is not because he stands alone. For it is just as true of the logic underlying the religions and the civilizations of the Far East, as it is of the logic that lies at the heart of all the institutions, religious, political, or what not,

[1] See my paper "The Logical Method of Science," *American Journal of Sociology*, 29 : 553-570 (March, 1924) for a few suggestions as to what the logic of science is in a position to contribute at this point. Quoting from pages 568, 569 of that article: "This is the unique opportunity of science, and for decades scientists have failed to see it. They alone, of all groups of thinkers in all ages, have achieved a logic that provides a basis upon which men who cannot agree on major premises can yet carry on a mutually fruitful discussion. In other words, the logic of science exalts *life* to the extent of expressly making it a bar before which all fundamental principles, major premises, and hypotheses must bow down in humble willingness to serve, and to be known by the fruits of their respective efforts to serve life and its needs."

that comprise our Western civilization—just as true that this *Eastern logic likewise lacks* a means for determining the truth or falsity of ultimate or metaphysical questions.

Hence it was inevitable that representatives of Eastern religions, in so far as they also might be able to adhere to their inherited logic, should be no less dogmatic than representatives of Christianity. No party to the many-cornered dispute being able to offer a logical technique that would enable all parties to *reason together* honestly, openly, and *without bias* regarding the possible truth or falsity of the *basic questions at issue* among them, it was literally unavoidable that each should dogmatize against all others as to the truth of his own position and the falsity of theirs. Dogmatism is a two-edged blade, no less than is the fallacy of question-begging that is usually involved in it; the dogmatist begs his own basic principles as true, and those of his opponent as erroneous; he begs his own position positively, and that of his opponent negatively.

Therefore, although as discussion waxed more and more heated there was certainly a *conflict* of rival religions, there was no *problem* such as that chosen for the theme of this paper. Time, however, plus the inherent humanity of men, had its usual broadening effect. Now and again an encounter would take place between a Christian and a leading Confucianist, Buddhist, or Mohammedan, both of whose minds were broad enough and their spirits great enough to mitigate the dogmatic rigors of their respective logics. As a result, discussion gradually achieved the high plane of frank and honest recognition on the part of each religion of truths in the opposing view; and *the PROBLEM of rival religions was born.*

III

This problem has proved sufficiently challenging to enlist for its solution many of the very best minds among modern Christians, and likewise others of equal rank from the religions of China and India. Chairs of comparative religion have been

established in many of our leading universities, and single courses in that subject are quite common. For a survey of the amount of time and labor that has been expended on this problem I can do no better than to commend the reader to a most able and scholarly article by Professor A. Eustace Haydon, of the Chair of Comparative Religion of the University of Chicago, entitled "Twenty-five Years of History of Religions." [2]

Professor Haydon devotes the second section of his paper to a résumé of the *methods* that have been utilized in bringing to light the histories of the several religions. I quote from the concluding paragraph of this section:

> History of religions is, however, no longer history in the sense of twenty years ago. The materials are part of a living, changing, social process and can be ensouled only by the fact-finding, critical, and interpretative aid of a score of methods belonging to other sciences. It is no longer a criticism and interpretation of texts nor the elaboration of a detached and selected portion of historic material, but a revivification of the materials by a reconstruction of the relations of the social situations by the aid of geography, physical anthropology, ethnology, archæology, linguistics, social psychology, and the other social sciences. The general history of religions has long required the collaboration of specialists in the various religions. It may be that the history of a single religion will now require the collaboration of specialists in the allied sciences. It will be more difficult, but it will be a living history. Out of it may come also, at last, an understanding of the meaning of religion.[3]

This statement of the methods that specialists in the field of comparative religion have used for the scientific analysis and clarification of that field is one that commands our utmost respect both for the field itself and for those who have conducted this extensive research within it. It is, therefore, a commendation of this work, rather than a reflection upon it, to suggest that achievements thus far have now made possible for us the insight essential to discovering that yet *another*

[2] *Journal of Religion*, 6 : 17-40 (January, 1926).
[3] Pages 37, 38.

technique is necessary for an *adequate* approach to the problem of rival religions. *I refer to the technique of logic.* Undoubtedly Professor Haydon's omission of this basic technique from his list of the methods used in the study of comparative religion is sufficient ground for the judgment that logic has not been used by specialists in this field in any *explicit or consciously critical fashion;* although I am convinced, as the sequel will abundantly show, that *they did use it*—even as every man uses logic in some fashion if he thinks at all—*uncritically* and *without any well-formulated conception of the precise rôle that it should play.*

IV

To illustrate both the lack and the need, on the part of specialists in the field of comparative religion, of a fully developed logic by which to guide their labors, I cannot do better than to continue a previous study of my own in connection with Professor Haydon's most searching and able criticism of it. In a recent issue of the *American Review* [4] I undertook to show the possibility of presenting the subject-matter of Christianity by the *intellectual method* of the logic of science. I tried to make clear the fact that this would necessitate our holding the basic concept of God not as a dogma or "given," but as a *scientific hypothesis;* an attitude which demands that the concept itself must be obtained, if it is to be obtained at all, *primarily by induction from the facts of human life,* facts both current and historical which may point with practical conclusiveness to this kind of God rather than to some other. I suggested too, that, because it refers to metaphysical subject-matter or content, this hypothesis of God is an *ultimate* or metaphysical hypothesis; a consideration which means that it cannot be subjected to immediate laboratory experiment as scientists test a *specific* hypothesis, but that it can be verified

[4] An article entitled "Fundamentalism and Experimental Logic," 3 : 537-547 (September-October, 1925).

only by and through *experimentation with secondary or more specific hypotheses* which are obtained both by *deduction* from the ultimate hypothesis that logically precedes them and by further *induction* from the facts of life. I added that there were no restrictions upon what these secondary or specific hypotheses should be other than saying that they must serve to bring the ultimate hypothesis of God into, and to keep it in, testable contact with life. Quoting from section VI of this earlier paper:

> Obviously these secondary hypotheses might be many and various. For instance . . . the content of the fundamentalist's faith might be disentangled from Aristotelian logic and incorporated in a set of hypotheses much like the following: (1) That God would undertake to teach men; (2) that his relations with Israel comprise an attempt at the task of teaching humans that was rendered peculiarly systematic by virtue of the fact that it was designed as preparatory to a more comprehensive course of instruction under Christ; (3) that Jesus Christ is God himself in the form of man, a device adopted by the Father to inject his teachings into the stream of human history in more objective form; (4) that the Bible is dependable for all practical purposes of life as an inspired Source-book for God's plan of action—a plan concerning which historical criticism may play an indispensable part by determining its historical content, but which God expects men to learn and test and know ultimately *only in the actual living* (*not verbal reading*) *of it.*

Here I trust that the reader will perceive that I was by no means seeking to present a complete *systematization of experimental logic* as applied to Christianity. I was attempting only to show, by suggesting a few of its more important possible links, the fact that such a systematization is needed, and to indicate the general form that I look for it to take: that is, the form of a *chain of mutually coherent logical propositions,* a chain that will be metaphysical at its more general or ultimate end, and entirely specific and immediately testable by scientific experiment at its concrete end.

In criticism of this statement of *sample links* in my recommended *sample* logical chain, I was honored by a letter from

Professor Haydon, who now kindly grants me permission to quote his reaction herein:

> This statement of the hypothesis ignores all the other religions of the world—of course you are not assuming that if there is a God he is the Jewish-Christian God. The hypothesis stated by a Hindu or by a Chinese intellectual would be a very different hypothesis. Would you not, therefore, save time and ages of testing by getting an hypothesis grounded on the known facts of religious history to start with? To state it in merely Christian terms seems arbitrary. God is more than Christian or your test fails at the start through indifference.

These words lay bare the very heart of the question before us. While they were not entirely relevant to the thought of my former paper, in which I was attempting only to deal with a question that has arisen *within Christianity,* they are most explicitly relevant to my present theme. I find myself not a little puzzled that Professor Haydon should criticize me for *ignoring* other religions than Christianity when Christianity was my only subject, unless it should be that he considered my *method of presenting* it to be such as to preclude the possible truth of other religions. A presentation of the *content* of Christianity would rule out the possible truth of other religions *only* in case that content should be presented by a dogmatic intellectual *method* [5] similar to that of traditional theology; yet I had expressly said that my method was that of *experimental logic* and its *device of hypothesis.* I had called attention to the fact that traditional theologians *beg the question* of the existence of a supernatural God. Having begged this basic question *as true,* that is, as an *absolute dogma,* of course they are then compelled to *beg negatively,* or rule out the possibility of the truth of, every proposition that is contrary to it.

I am unable to explain the fact that Professor Haydon attributes this same logical failing to me except by assuming

[5] My fullest statement, thus far, of this distinction between *method* and *content* is contained in a paper entitled "A Behavioristic Approach to the Christian Idea of God," which comprises a forty-four page issue of the *Culver-Stockton Quarterly* (July-October, 1925) published by Culver Stockton College, Canton, Missouri.

that I have not yet succeeded in making clear to him just what and how much I mean by *experimental logic* and its *method of hypothesis*. I base this judgment also on reactions that have come from other able thinkers; many of these show by their comments that they have not caught the whole drift of the story, and some explicitly ask for further elaboration. This is in no sense surprising. Experimental logic is the last-born child of modern science, born not many decades after its youthful mother revived with her resourceful personality and disordered with the contents of her hope chest the sedate widower's quarters of the father, philosophy; and it remains to be seen whether the child will live. Assuredly, then, it is also a question whether experimental logic will grow sufficiently to be able to do the work I am laying before it: that of surveying and systematically charting the fields of metaphysics and epistemology, as a basis for thoroughgoing experimentalism not only in religion but in *all of the social sciences*.[6] Consequently, it will be necessary for me to devote the next three sections of this paper to a fuller statement of experimental logic applied to one religion, Christianity, as a means of showing how it may be applied to all religions for a solution of the problem involved in their rivalry.

V

I have said in various ways and in different published papers that my conception of God is presented by the logical device of *scientific hypothesis,* that is, that my God *is, methodologically* speaking, a scientific hypothesis *rather than* a dogma. I have explained also that I mean, by applying this methodological term to God, that I *DO NOT KNOW* a single thing, *ontologically* speaking, about a supernatural God. I do not know that he exists. I do not know that he is knowable.

[6] I should remind the reader at this point that the aim of the present paper is not so ambitious as to attempt to deal with more than one of the social sciences, namely, religion. Indeed scientific method demands that the approach to the field of religion by a single writer be made in the concrete and specific fashion of *beginning* with only one religion—in this case, the one I know best, that is, Christianity.

I do not know what his character is. I do not know what may be his relation to the world and to humankind. I confess the completest ignorance on all these points.

In this state of ignorance several possible modes of procedure, or methods of dealing with the problem, open before me:

1. I may *avoid* the problem by forgetting about it and immersing myself in business or pleasure or any pursuit that is sufficiently absorbing, or by accepting a solution of it on the authority of some philosopher or theologian.

2. I may avoid the problem—which, let us remember, is the question of the existence, character, knowability, etc., of a supernatural God—by *waving all supernaturalism aside* as inherently beyond the scope of the human mind. This course would require, obviously, that any conception of God which I might afterwards formulate would be a *naturalistic* conception. It would take some such form as: identifying God with nature; conceiving him as an immanent Spirit animating nature; or thinking of him as a symbol for some particular phase of nature such as the Common Will of Humanity.

3. I may *deny the reality of the problem* by refusing to admit my own ignorance. I can thus dogmatize either in the bold manner of traditional theologians; or I can adopt the reluctant dogmatism of Professor Macintosh by beginning with a "formal definition of God," which I would justify by asserting that I was "already practically sure, on the basis of religious experience, that God really exists," and also by arguing that my admitted dogmatism on this basic point was "dogmatic only as every empirical science is dogmatic."[7]

4. I may concede that all old methods of dealing with metaphysical problems are inadequate for grappling with questions regarding a supernatural God, and *seek new ways* by which to approach this whole field; *new methods of testing the*

[7] Compare Douglas Clyde Macintosh, "Theology as an Empirical Science," pp. 27-29.

truth or falsity of belief (or unbelief) in the existence, the character, and the relation to man's world, of a God who is held to be greater than nature, and who would therefore be for us a way of conceiving Ultimate Reality.

As was at least implicitly indicated in the paper that Professor Haydon criticizes, I choose this fourth mode of approach. I seek to *face the problem* of my own ignorance concerning a supernatural God with a frankness that *asks no odds whatever* from atheists or agnostics. As a first step in this approach, I admit without qualification that the method of the empirical sciences as it has been generally developed thus far *is not applicable* to ultimate or metaphysical questions like that of the existence of a supernatural God. Neither, in fact, is it applicable to questions regarding the *existence of the basic fields* of the empirical sciences; for these too are metaphysical questions concerning which Professor Macintosh correctly observes that the scientists themselves dogmatize. However, having admitted the inapplicability of scientific method, in its present state of development, to the problem confronting me, I should *not,* like Professor Macintosh, point to this logical limp on the part of scientists *as an excuse* for similar dogmatism as to God's existence, and then try to atone for that unempirical start by being strictly empirical throughout the rest of my system. On the contrary, by my admission that present-day scientific method is inadequate for dealing with metaphysical questions, I mean *explicitly and strictly* that the case for theism, or faith in a God who is greater than nature, *is hopeless* so long as scientific method retains the form that it holds today in the minds of ninety-nine per cent. of scientists.

What justification is there, however, for assuming that scientific method has achieved its final form, has reached full-blown perfection? I, for one, find it impossible to conceive scientific method in such static fashion as this. As I read the thoughts of a few scientific philosophers, especially those of

Charles Sanders Peirce [8] and Professor Dewey, I am convinced that we have here the *germs* of an extensive development of scientific method. In my judgment these logical path-finders have opened up possibilities, one of which I am deliberately seizing when I suggest that we should undertake the task of *developing the logic of science* to the point where it can be *used in the field of metaphysics.*[9]

(To be concluded in April issue)

[8] I should be more specific regarding Peirce. I see little in his *symbolic* logic to aid this development of scientific method. There is much, however, in the volume "Chance, Love, and Logic," edited by Morris R. Cohen, Part I of which was first published in the *Popular Science Monthly* in 1877-78, under the title "Illustrations of the Logic of Science." Quite suggestive also is his article, "A Neglected Argument for the Reality of God," in the *Hibbert Journal*, 7 : 106.

[9] The term "metaphysics" has been used in so many different senses that it is necessary for me to say that I mean by it to designate a field comprising: (1) the *ultimate existential principles* that *underlie* logic and into which logical principles unavoidably shade, such as the matter-of-fact existence of the respective fields of the sciences, the existence and nature of the world as a whole, or the existence and nature of a God underlying the world; and (2) the *epistemological* principles that are, from our standpoint, *yet more ultimate* than any of these, such as the reliability of our senses and the dependability of our perceptive and cognitive powers. A most important distinction, however, between my use of "metaphysics" and other common uses of that term is to be seen in the fact that I *do not admit* that, from the logical generality or ultimacy of this field, it follows that our thinking concerning it *must needs be absolute or dogmatic.* As I see it, we are no less free in this field than we are in any other to choose the intellectual method of hypothesis in *preference* to the intellectual method of dogmatism. By my choice of the former of these methods all metaphysical principles, assumptions, or postulates *become hypotheses,* with varying degrees of ultimacy and resting finally on the basic hypotheses of epistemology; but they do not cease to be metaphysical merely because of our learning to think of them in terms of experimental science.

THE PLACE OF "RELIGIOUS EDUCATION" IN PREPARING FOR CHURCH ADMINISTRATION[1]

Professor STEWART G. COLE
Crozer Theological Seminary

THIS is rather an inopportune time to ask one to adjudge the place of religious education in the seminary curriculum. For several reasons:

1. Religious educationalists admit that their discipline has not yet been discovered in a clearly defined manner. A careful survey of seminary catalogues bears out this fact. Not only has it yet to measure its range and task, but it is dependent for its principles and technique upon social sciences which are still in experimental stages of making.

2. Churchmanship is in process of self-redefinition. At this period of rethinking the doctrine of the church, no one but the traditionalist is sure just what clergy should be prepared to do today.

3. Fundamental questions of religion challenge the student. Just what is the field of religion? What can religion do to emancipate men from an age dominated by political parochialism, racial superiority complexes, economic imperialism? How can religion lend men power to use the potentialities generated by modern science and experimental democracy for the interests of universal humankind?

4. Seminary curriculum itself rocks restless in an administrative sea uncertain of its social objective or of its advisable content. Changing educational philosophy and shifting religious vocations are doubtless responsible for this wide-spread discontent, a discontent that will continue till preliminary questions are answered.[2]

[1] Paper read at the Fifth Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges of the United States and Canada, held in Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., June 30, 1926.

[2] The conflict is clearly described by Justin Wroe Nixon, in an article, "Theological Education at the Cross Roads," Part I, *Christian Work*, January 2, 1926.

This professional embarrassment is not solely the burden of the religious educationalist. All who share in seminary instruction are ill at ease in the face of these problems. Of this condition the program committee of this Conference were thoroughly conversant. It was their intention to have some men stir up the subsoil of curricular theory to afford the convention opportunity to confer on questions near and common to all. With this introductory intent the writer presents this paper. It portends pathfinding rather than roadmaking. He will try to make clear as he proceeds,

First, the necessity of a comprehensive theory of seminary curriculum as a basis for consideration of the function of a so-called Department of Religious Education;

Second, the philosophic principle of religious education as he conceives it;

Third, how that principle makes all historic departments of seminary instruction agencies of religious education; and

Fourth, how that principle points the way for a new department, better called "Parish Administration," and defines its task.

What Is the Function of Seminary Curriculum?

The intent of a Department of Religious Education is lodged in the larger purpose of seminary curriculum. What, then, is the function of the seminary study program?

Two conflicting philosophies of training struggle for supremacy in administrations. The one conceives of its task in terms of a supernaturalistic and authoritative knowledge to be mediated to ministers in order to equip them for their sacred mission. The other considers its course to introduce youth to the resources of God latent in human personality and active in present-day culture, to interpret these resources by recourse to an historical study of such institutions, literatures, and values as have made men what they now are, and to utilize these historical and contemporary findings to promote in the

present better personality and a more sociable world.[3] It makes a vast difference which theory a seminary chooses to make operative in its teaching policy. If it elects a heritage of Christian revelation as its directive principle, then its curriculum is preelected by virtue of the concreteness of its historical sectarian emphasis, and its administration is comparatively free from the anxieties that provoke the prophetic leader. If, rather, the seminary attempts to orient its students in the world of folks, a folk-world baffling in intricacies of organization, of motive, and of destiny-fixating forces, and to equip its students with historical and sociological materials which they can use skilfully with such interwoven and interweaving humans, then it sets for itself a policy that all but disheartens the bravest educational statesman. The older approach to seminary program may be described as metaphysical, other-worldly, authoritarian, and deductive. The newer attitude is humanistic, this-worldly, experimental, and vocational. The first leads to theological education; the second to religious education. Public schools and higher institutions of learning have long since abandoned the former and embraced the latter method in their educational theory. There is a deliberate tendency among seminary men to move deliberately toward the second view-point.[4] This paper supposes the future efficacy of

[3] Doctor Kelly describes the two tendencies thus:

One tendency is to place the emphasis upon the divine element in the origin of the church . . . the other tendency is to place the emphasis upon the empirical element in the development of the church, and to uphold the view of a continuing revelation, which precludes the fixation of creeds; the teaching of the one group emphasizes the authority of a final revelation, the teaching of the other group emphasizes an unfolding revelation; the emphasis in one case is upon the "supernatural" origin of the church and in the other case upon its "natural" development. These two groups are commonly referred to as "conservatives" and "liberals."—*R. S. Kelly, "Theological Education in America," p. 212.*

[4] In the symposium "Theological Education in 1925" in *Christian Education*, January, 1926, many seminaries express a strong urge for courses dealing with "the application of Christian principles in the life of today."

One administrator contributes, "We . . . have arranged our curriculum in a group system, developed in the light of present-day demands upon church and ministry"; another, "Our curriculum has been completely revised during the last four years . . . practical courses, adopted to meet the rapidly changing needs of both the city and the rural church, have been added."

Justin Wroe Nixon in "Theological Education at the Crossroads," Part III, *Christian Work*, January 16, 1926, advocates that the problems of contemporary religion be made the organizing principle of seminary courses of study. He pays his respects to courses organized around such interests as "The Son of Man Concept," "The North Galatian Theory," "The Multiple Authorship of Isaiah," and to such defensive supports as their instructors give, viz., "it

the seminary lies in appropriating the modern vocational approach.

There is another set of claims upon seminary policy. This challenge emanates from the ministerial student. His interests should be thoughtfully weighed. The university-trained man seeks church leadership today because of opportunities it affords to help this generation of men resolve their vital issues of life. He is thinking of his prospective office not primarily in terms of preachments of eternal truth to be delivered to perishing souls, as he is in terms of a personality to invest in human good-will, in social reconstruction, in fellowship quest for God.

If this seminary freshman could articulate his feelings as he enters (he can and does after he leaves!) he would say something like this:

First, give me a professional school in which the atmosphere is so clear and wholesome that I may maintain a free, growing, social-minded, Christian experience during my days of vocational training.

This student is not asking to be shielded from facing religious problems. He is asking for a situation fearless and fraternal where he can work out his professional salvation with a wholly positive and constructive satisfaction to faith.

His second request is, Permit me at graduation to make the transition from the seminary to the parish with the maximum of efficiency carried over to my official business.

To accomplish this the seminary should bring the student directly into touch with the current culture world in miniature in the classroom, so that when he steps out from it he enters the same school of life on a larger scale. This request would

teaches the student method," "it disciplines the mind of the man," by affirming that this disciplinary argument has been greatly overworked by educators as psychological theories have proven. "Educational leaders are more and more skeptical of the transfer of training which this answer implies."

Joseph H. Coffin in a very striking article "Make the Curriculum Fit the Man," in the *Survey*, May 15, 1926, pp. 89-92, appeals for the "functionalizing" of the curriculum. "What are the legitimate, normal life functions of mature, intelligent men? This question properly answered would seem to provide a genuine principle for curriculum building."

not entail a diminution of scholarship in the training-school, unless by scholarship is meant formal discipline. It would mean an orientation of seminary study in the social *milieu* of the day permitting the student acquaintance with the intricate and all but elusive laws of personality, of mob and reflective group psychology, of the social forces constituting in their creative fusing the social process, which is the character-making stream in every home and church and community.

His further request is, Give me a study background whereby I can order a philosophy of life that is thoroughly grounded in the Christian faith but equally focused in contemporary human and cosmic realism.

Christianity needs social orientation to save it from sponsoring a purely utopian Kingdom of God. The younger churchman desires a philosophy of life that tempers its faith in God by its acquaintance with man and his world, rather than *vice versa*. He desires to find his prophetic utterances in a clear appreciation of the trend of history rather than in ecstatic visions of the mystic. This life perspective is expected to help the student so to integrate his social thinking that he credits every man, woman, and child with religious experience in degree as the individual finds fulness of life in his world of action. It is the business of the seminary to assist the student to find the evolutionary cosmic and human orders, and to permit him such appreciation of the present stage of human-cosmic cooperative good-will that he will carry to a faith-perplexed world a confidence in himself and in God rooted in aggressive personal experience and in fearless metaphysical realism. This philosophy of life should never be an indoctrination once for all committed in the classroom, but a fluid and vital functioning of the whole person in relation to his complete environment.

But another party sets his claims before the seminary administration. This is the local parishioner. He may be a tradesman-parent-Republican-German-Methodist. She may be

a housewife-mother-missionary enthusiast-eugenicist-Baptist. The child may be a gangster-sixth-grader-New Englander-only child-bootblack. Each member of the parish requires individual attention. Parish voices are without number. Their problem and life-interest appeals are as legionary. Let the seminary instructor not turn a deaf ear to their summons. For the educational function of the seminary should depend in large measure for its answer upon what the purpose of its student leadership is to be; the business of the student in turn is commensurate with the life needs of the members of the parish. Thus it is the task of the educator to honor the claims of the parishioner, confused as they are, and to make them consequential in seminary policy.

The administration may interpret the convulsive call of the parishioner monistically. If so, there is one need of mankind, irrespective of age, sex, class, or race, i. e., God and salvation from sin. The answer to this need is found in the stereotyped program of study which the seminary has indorsed in former years. There is also the pluralistic answer of the educationalist. He makes use of the social sciences to look inductively into human life and he finds that folks differ widely in personal problems. For that reason they require individual treatment based on the most accurate social diagnosis. From this angle of concern the policy of the seminary undergoes radical change. The curriculum will be ordered in terms of personal and community inquiry, laboratory testing, experimental therapeutics. Thus churchmen in the making will catch human contagion, determine technique, and sift out religious materials which serve more feasibly the folks of the local parish.

The Place of "Religious Education" in Curriculum Theory

If the seminary approach to education is considered a person-person, rather than a person-revelation bond, and if

the seminary seeks to equip men to be ministers of individually defined yet socially related mortals striving for a better immortality, then the function of the school becomes clear.[5] It is to act as a vocational laboratory in which students become acquainted with the folks they are to serve and learn what historical instruments best meet their needs, and have practise in wielding these tools in preparation for independent and trustworthy professional leadership after their graduation.

A consideration of the work of the traditional departments of seminary training in the light of this vocational principle will help to elucidate the implications inferred. In the Old and New Testament Departments such a postulate as the unquestioned priority of the Bible in Christian training must be given up as frankly untenable. The theory[6] "that the curriculum should be built around the Biblical courses," that "the Scriptures should furnish us with our organizing principle," fails to hold in the face of the foregoing view. Why? Modern Biblical scholarship itself has militated against the view that the Scriptures are the seat of authority in religion, the vehicle of infallible truth, the guide and charter of living. The Biblicist looks upon his manuscripts not as ends in themselves, but rather as literary documents reflecting the diversified interests of a religious people. Vocational churchmanship lends its support, and refuses to permit a literature to take precedence over life in religion. Not that either discounts the exalted value of the Bible; rather that each makes it depend for its prestige upon the character of its service to the parish constituency.

The Department of Church History once was used to find apostolic succession, or some principle of institutional author-

[5] The task of the seminary is to organize the experience of the student in such a fashion that in the three or four years of his professional training, he may become intimately acquainted with and learn how to attack, scientifically, the definite situations and problems which he must meet as a religious leader."—*Justin Wroe Nixon, "Theological Education at the Crossroads," Part II, Christian Work, January 9, 1926.*

[6] Symposium in *Christian Education*, "Theological Education in 1925," January 26, p. 124.

ity to support a sect's peculiar traits, and thus give the student a theistic anchorage for his ecclesiastical group. This view has been all but lost in recent objective effort to find in the history of the church the sequence of events leading to present confusing sectarian emphases and to predict ways and means of directing churches in the interests of Christian comity. Systematic theology, not long since, "the queen of the sciences," by virtue of the fact that every one believed a well-ordered set of doctrines was the measuring-rod of soundness in the faith, has lost its aristocratic dignity in the pragmatic challenge of the present. Its doctrines are now estimated in terms of their genesis in the historic group, their functional value in various strata of society, and their survival significance in the imminent conditioning world. Homiletics has harbored the technique for conveyance of this material of revealed religion to a lost world. The preacher presented the truth of God as these other fields of seminary study set it forth. Today the history of preaching is examined to learn why the homily has had such primacy in Christianity and to determine what just share it may have today for the proper balancing of Christianity as a way of discourse and Christianity as a way of life. The Department of History and Philosophy of Religion has been used to compare Christianity with other world-religions in order to present the absolute superiority of the Western cult and its distinctive favor with God. Lately men are treating religions with respect to their native beginnings, the people they serve, and the contributions they have made to indigenous culture. Christianity is not so much considered in comparison with such cults as it is in friendly alliance with them in the creation of a more catholic faith in the human family.

In short, the modern seminary is discounting the conception of a fixed revelation in a literature, an institution, a creed, and a gospel, considered as authoritarian agencies of human control, to give recognition to survival values of rare worth in

a book, a church, a belief, and a message. Churchmen are relinquishing the idea of the Christian minister's supernatural commission to build the Kingdom of God, to come to terms with the view that he is invited to cooperate with other vocational experts in society, each contributing in his especial sphere such professional service as his office permits, all working in unison, certain that thus they may introduce to men the world of God's choice. The forward-looking educator of the seminary is moving out from the pessimism of faith in a God whose sole redemptive policy is locked up in an ancient book and a medieval institution, into the meliorism, if not optimism, of confidence in a God who is found functional in the life of the child and in the heart of the cosmic process.

Is there not another logical step to take which would clarify thinking on this phase of the subject? Traditionally seminary training has been termed "theological education." This emphasis smacks of the philosophical theory herein repudiated. "Theological" training as such is at best doctrinaire. It sets creed and rationability over life and liberty. The quest of the theologian for interpretative truth in matters religious is necessary and commendatory. But if carried on independent of the human teachable factor it becomes philosophy rather than education. The finely groomed metaphysician is not necessarily a well-equipped human physician. Not "theological" but "religious" education more accurately speaks the intent of the modern seminary.

The department called "Religious Education" in the seminary is hardly appropriately named. The title is markedly deceptive intensifying the conception of "theological" emphasis and causing the misnomer "theological education" to linger unduly in seminary circles. If the supposition is taken literally that only one department of the seminary engages in "religious education," it discredits the religious and educational values resident in the Biblical and other departments.

It puffs up this youngest department with a false pride and may lead to belief that it should lord it over the older and less "religious" disciplines by virtue of its divine right to dictate. Are the studies of the history of Israel, the life of Jesus, the Mediæval Church, or the Westminster Confession, "theological" rather than "religious"? What right have they to be? Little right indeed in a vocational school and in a democratic age.

All departments in the seminary are engaged in religious education in so far as they are parties to the historical method of inquiry. This technique of investigation is slowly becoming the approved form of procedure throughout the professional school. But this method is not a perfect instrument. It is yet in the laboratory stages of making. Like all other sociological tools, it shares the tentativeness of the social sciences. The historical method is becoming increasingly sound as it incorporates in its strategy the complex of environmental and humanitarian forces active in the society under investigation, and relates them genetically in keeping with the factors found in the case study. In so far as a literature is necessary to this study, such documents must be submitted to the most careful historical, linguistic, and psychological interrogation in order to get back to the life of the author, and the society the author and his message represent.

Such work is the work of religious education. It is not its completed task, but it is fundamental as far as it goes. There are some phases of religious education that these traditional departments with their modern technique cannot contribute. This necessitates the addition of another department to seminary training set-up. It has been called "the Department of Religious Education." This title the reader disclaims as either appropriate or legitimate. The work of the whole school is religiously educational. The new department might well be named "The Department of Parish Administration."

The Department of Parish Administration and Seminary Policy

Where the historical method is operative in the five well-known fields of seminary instruction, the student is becoming acquainted with the materials of historical Christianity in their literature, institutional, belief, and value phases. It remains for him to focus his perspective by a critical introduction to contemporary Christianity as it finds expression in the multiple processes of current culture. For Christianity this culture finds its form and force in the local parish. The studies involved in Parish Administration lend themselves to three types of investigation:[7] First, an introduction to the personal forces in parish life; second, a critical analysis of materials for the religious needs of these persons; and third, a technique of parish administration to use the values of Christianity in the interests of the better and fuller life of the people.

1. *The Personal Forces in Parish Life*

The answer as to what constitute the personal forces of the parish depends upon the faith one has in current studies of personality. Like H. N. Wieman, in his recent interesting book "Religious Experience and Scientific Method," and like J. B. S. Haldane whom Wieman quotes, one may discredit psychology, sociology, and allied disciplines as pseudo-scientific. If so, the educator relies on common sense or speculative philosophy to estimate folks. Philosophy *a priori* is foreign to the spirit of this inquiry. Common sense is too subjective to be serviceable in serious work. The social sciences emerging from academic workshops are virtually critically and inductively refined common sense. They represent the most hopeful sources of knowledge men have regarding human nature.

[7] From the program outlined in this section of the paper it will be observed that a corps of specialists are required to take care of this phase of seminary curriculum. And in a vocational school why should not there be as many trained men engaged in an analysis of the problems of contemporary Christianity as there are in a treatment of historical Christianity?

Upon them the wise seminary builder depends for guidance. As the Biblical and other traditional departments have incorporated them in the form of the historical method, so the teachers of parish administration take them over to direct in rearing their program.

What phases of the social sciences should be incorporated in seminary courses? Here it is difficult for the humanist to draw a limiting line. Naturally he urges the most complete acquaintanceship with folks possible. Under any circumstances churchmen should have grounding in the psychology of the developing personality, in the sociology of community groups, and in the social forces constituting the type of culture in which they are to work. The student should be taught to see the church in its pluralistic rôles and to ask what may be considered the functions of the church in the light of such personal, institutional, and value forces as urge the parish and wider culture forward.

To be specific, what is involved educationally in such a study as the development of personality? The social scientist has ceased to think of the individual as a microcosm to be portrayed independent of his native setting. The student of human life undertakes to interpret the person in terms of his complete life situation. A boy lives, moves, and forges his selfhood in the interactionary maelstrom of hourly experience. This bi-activity of boy and environment in the bond of experience is the social process. This process is the medium of education. It is also the procreative vehicle of religion. Herein lies the "vocation of living." On the stout thread of this order of experience children and youth become increasingly personal and social, and adults are made more and more "set" in character for good or ill. The soul and its behavioristic haunts are poles of description of the person involved. This view-point preempts the churchman from treating mortals as simple replicas of Adam. This principle makes it quite clear that the churchman undertakes different professional

missions when he passes from the rural to the urban dweller, or as he moves from trade to professional people, as he shifts from down-town to suburban residents, or from the Negro in his racial island to the white in his favored community. Churchmanship is as multiple as the types of social classes our modern civilization is creating.

Social recognition is due subnormal people. Many folks are becoming mentally disordered, morally delinquent, or culturally misfitting in the increasingly complicated social order. To these the parish leader must turn his professional care. The need of personal problem clinics and private confessionals is becoming self-evident in every American community. Who better than the minister can stand in this citadel of service, if only he is a trained psychiatrist! Dr. Richard Cabot has called attention to this salvaging work in a most suggestive article "Adventures in the Borderland of Ethics," in the *Survey*, December 1, 1925, pp. 275ff. He believes the minister in the making should spend a year in hospital service doing clinical work with the broken in body and bruised in mind. His profession is conversant with the fact that a growing number of people are ill primarily for want of self-understanding. Medication is a secondary remedial. Sex, domestic, economic, religious complexes turn the health of body and peace of mind of hundreds of weary mortals. Ministers should, thinks Doctor Cabot, learn a technique to unravel the skeins of difficulty and disillusionment that enfold these folks.[8] Undoubtedly seminary men would benefit by an introduction to such urgent work, and men who plan to practise in more crowded areas of human activity should be especially qualified in this confessional art.

It is not the aim of the religious expert to impose anything extraneous upon this surging stream of personal experience. This method has been attempted in the past with dis-

[8] Cf. Anton T. Boisen, "The Challenge to Our Seminaries," *Christian Work*, January 23, 1926.

heartening results. It is the work of the leader to liberate the individual in his life situation so that he can organize his experience, direct it, and enrich it according to the highest ambitions that well up within him. This is far from a simple mission. When one attempts to weigh the potentialities resident in human heredity, biological and social, when one ventures to sound the resources operative in typical conscious experience, when one considers the idiosyncrasies of interplaying personalities in the machinations of society, the educator is sobered in his ambitious scheme. The art of making souls is fraught with delicacies the religionist has not yet measured. The forces that impinge on personality and the forces that focus within personality, with their resolving complications, the parish administrator has thus far little understood.

Most churchmen have evaded the responsibility of learning how character is achieved. They have yet to be convinced of the law-abiding growth of the human individual and of the possibility of mastering that law with increasing degree of accuracy. To prejudge the nature of the soul is possibly to insult or injure the person. Professionally that would be the equivalent of the medical doctor's guess. Is it not morally incumbent on ministers to be human nature specialists as it is on physicians to be anatomical scientists? God's sons are immensely important; they are tremendously involved devices; yet they live and grow according to law. They are to be understood, and consequently most wisely served by the church, as the minister intelligently studies them.

If only to suggest the immediacy of this field of research, consider these questions: At what age is human personality most susceptible to rapid character change and under what circumstances? Schoolmen have set up a workable I. Q. for grading children. Can not churchmen experimentally determine a character quotient to assist them in measuring the religion of the individual? For instance, what progress toward self-control and social orientation should a five-year-old have

achieved in open-country culture or in urban society? What a ten-year-old? What a fifteen-year-old? What are the relative moral values in prevailing kinds of community recreations? What degree of supervision and what of self-direction in them should a developing child be privileged to have? A Chicago judge of the Juvenile Court is responsible for the remark that the radio is more influential for good in boy life than the Sunday school. Who will deny or affirm its truth? Men have not yet investigated boys to get at the facts and learn what interests insure the greatest character returns. In how far and in what settings is Bible study conducive to changing child attitudes and ideals? What is the comparative value for a child to be told that God loves him and for the child to find that out for himself? Is it possible that indoctrination is always wrought with injury to personal freedom and consequent pragmatic faith? These and a thousand other inquiries wait for the Christian leader to penetrate if he is to enlarge his command over the educative process.

This is the work of the churchman! This is preparatory work in the seminary! When does the Kingdom of God come in a human soul? In the twinkling of an eye? Perhaps. If so, in relatively small measure. If it should ever come in the individual and in society, it must enter according to the laws of human nature, and as St. Augustine inferred, "piece by piece and bit by bit." It comes as churchman and parishioner contribute their full "increment of utility" to each other while pursuing their related ambitions in the daily make-up of life.

Sufficient has been indicated to point out how varied are the leadership demands placed upon the minister of personal problems today. It is quite possible that the future of churchmanship will become so diversified that the seminary will have to consider the advisability of training various kinds of personality specialists rather than Jacks-of-all-church-trades. Certainly a few parish distinctions are patent. Rural and urban church enterprises are entirely different projects now. So also

down-town and suburban, or industrial area and college campus, church schemes. Likewise children, youth, and adult church constituencies require different orders of leadership. One interesting index to this new churchmanship emerging to express the challenge of a changing social world is to be found in the new vernacular rising in ecclesiastical circles. Besides the old religious categories used to describe the conditions or treatment of people, one often hears now such terms as the following: Bad tonsils, an only child, inferiority complex, gang mores, malnutrition, neurasthenia, desire for divorce, a new environment called for, more and better air, undisciplined social attitudes, maligned personal motives, a living wage, vocational guidance, supervised play, case work, and so on.

2. The Religious Materials for Parish Life

This theme might be considered settled in view of what has been granted in an earlier stage in this paper. It has been affirmed that the subject-matter of the Biblical, church history and theological departments afford the churchman the materials of religious education, provided they have been treated genetically in classroom study. This is true with reservation.

Consider the Biblical studies. Today they are depriving men of the sense of Scriptural sacredness and infallible guarantee. The historical and linguistic methods jointly employed in reproducing the life and religion of the Hebrews and early Christians are inductive in approach and descriptive in content. If this understanding of the Bible, as reliable as it is, is the minister's only training in the Scriptures, he is hardly prepared to use the Bible in his parish. His is an objective and scientific treatment. The people demand a subjective and inspirational presentation. In the seminary the student must become conversant with an academic universe of discourse, necessary to accurate thinking. In the pulpit and in parish conference the same man is supposed to employ the popular uncritical dialect of the people. The localization and authenticity of the

"E" documents in the Pentateuch is a fitting subject for classroom investigation but hardly for preaching utterance. On the other hand, the providential bulrushes is an appropriate topic for the pulpit but scarcely a likely subject for seminary consideration. These comparisons give point to a problem in seminary curriculum that has yet to be adequately met in the interests of parish well-being. The two requirements are as different as oil and water. Nor does efficiency in the former contribute to success in the latter. Indeed the sociological approach in the classroom tends to wean the student away from the primary loyalty to the Bible values his parishioners personally cherish and expect of their pastor.[9]

To put the problem directly, What is the modern use of the Bible? How can a book treated historically on week-days be made normative on Sunday? Perhaps it cannot and should not be. The two view-points in seminary and church, the two purposes, the two universes of discourse, are so widely divergent that the gulf has not yet been bridged by the trainers of churchmen. When the allegorical or literal methods of Bible study were in vogue, no such hiatus appeared. But with a sociological attitude to the Scriptures, the inspirational use of the manuscripts has broken down. What is the modern use of First Chronicles? Some Old Testament scholars assert that there is no current value for the book, as for many other sections of the Bible. Has the Mosaic Decalogue a modern use? New Testament baptism? The Apocalypse? If so, what? What is legitimate use of the new birth doctrine of the Fourth Gospel? Is it right to use it as the teaching of Jesus when the scholars of the Gospels are one in denying that it is of Hebraic origin? Is it misrepresentation to make it the monistic basis for a soteriology to cover all men? How can a man develop a homiletical and teaching use of the Scriptures that serves the needs of men, without at the same time falsify-

[9] G. B. Smith has raised this question and treated it in a very significant manner in an article, "The Reconstruction of Religious Loyalty."—*Journal of Religion*, II, 1922, p. 192f.

ing the facts of history? Apparently Christians still want their Bible. They desire seminary trained men to give them their Bible in enriched form. How is this book to be rediscovered for lay-human service? At a recent meeting of the Students' Association of the Middle Atlantic Theological Seminaries, the men asserted that one of the greatest weaknesses of their professional training hinged right here: They had learned much about how to study the Bible, but they were at a loss to know how to use their Bible effectively in parish work.

Is this new type of treatment of our Scriptures to become a phase of the Department of Church Administration responsibility, or is it to be thrust back upon the Biblical instructor for solution? That the practical issue must sooner or later be regarded as a distinct discipline of seminary endeavor is becoming quite evident. Unless of course the school prefers to allow its men to continue their trial-and-error policy, or permits the book to become a negligible factor in Christian practises.

The question raised with Biblical materials can likewise be ascribed to the subject-matter of the other seminary departments. To take but one illustration: What is the modern use of the Jesus of history? Granted the seminaries are beyond the traditional interpretation of the Christ with its supernaturalistic trappings, are not most men still a party to a metaphysical Christ of cosmic proportions and cosmic control? Assuredly they have no basis for such comprehensive guarantee in the light of the historical study of Jesus of Nazareth? Is it right then to becloud men's faith by associating Jesus of history with Christ of faith? That Jesus will remain a superb power in human life, no one will deny. What is the modern use of Jesus? How are teachers to train men for the critical historical study of the first century Prophet and Saviour and at the same time fit them for positive, legitimate inspirational use of Jesus in local parishes?

But the materials of the five historic departments in seminaries, supposing the problems raised here are satisfactorily

ironed out, are not sufficient for church work. No seminary can limit its investigation to the subject-matter of Christianity without restricting the vision of ministers and the heritage of the church. There are materials, for instance, in human biography, which are of inestimable service to the parish prophet. Great sheaves of the findings and stories of the devotions of scientists are essential to make life worthy for the local parishioner. The wonders and beauties of Mother Nature constitute a source of materials which no religious teacher can afford to neglect without doing injustice to God and the individual soul. The desires of various races of men, the ambitions of the working classes, the policies of contemporary political states, cannot be overlooked without loss of focus in the issues of the Kingdom of God. So the range of significant materials for religious education in the local parish widens. No subject-matter in the long past or in the fleeting present is to be dismissed which can be utilized to shed light on the meaning of life and lend dynamic to the individual in his struggle for moral and spiritual status.

To raise the question as to which type of material the seminary instructor should hold in higher esteem, that emanating from Christian sources or that arising from other religions and from other than religious phases of human life, does not seem to the writer to meet the issue quite fairly. Is not this the test of superiority, What material can the churchman use most pointedly to unfold the wings of imagination to help folks see life whole and expectant? And what material can he muster to open the floodgates of their emotions to make such idealism as they have dreamed realism in home, shop, and street? Subject-matter taken out of Christian history does not always prove the best resources for this activistic end. The skilful teacher will discover that he can use the simple stuff of the every-day experience to quicken his parishioners, if he has ears to hear and eyes to see the workings of the Good-Samaritan God on the byways of open country or urban areas. It should

be remembered that not the source of the text but its utility marks its right to be registered as fit for religious ends. What a loss would incur to church forces if the seminary taught its men that the only materials of religious education were the resources of historic Christianity! The seminary virtually does that, if it does not make a place on its roster of courses for the use of extra-Christian literature and experience in parish service.

3. *The Technique of Parish Administration*

If the church in the local parish is to sponsor a redeeming life motivation and to forge instruments of spiritual service, then it requires a location, a plant, equipment, an organization of forces, and a program to carry out its projected functions. This necessitates in this division of the Department of Parish Administration such courses as, church utilities, the church and worship, the schools of the church, church expansion at home and abroad, methods of teaching religion, and types of church leadership in the community. This sounds like a rather heavy order. It is, but how to shear away courses from the roster without grave neglect to the prospective parish prophet and engineer seems to the writer quite impossible. What does it profit a man if he knows historical Christianity but has no program for the present generation of men? Or what should a man give in exchange for social fitness to lead? Both perspectives are eminently important. Both can be learned simultaneously in a vocationally-pitched seminary program. An introductory word will be offered in favor of the afore-mentioned courses in technique in what follows:

The minister-to-be is familiarized in classroom with the types of church plants and equipments being developed today to meet the various orders of community need. He will recognize a preaching-post, a box-car building, an Akron style institution, a sectarian agency, a community center church, a college chapel, or a three-unit worship, educational, and recrea-

tional plant. He will learn how to evaluate these orders of churches in terms of geographical and social location. This latter qualification presumes acquaintance with the sociology of religion and with methods of parish survey. The student is also versed in the range and functionary purposes of such types of equipment as clutter or adorn these many forms of institutions of mercy and love.

No course in the seminary requires more careful treatment than that dealing with the church and worship. Much that Christians do in the name of worship is neither congratulatory to themselves nor complimentary to the good God they propose to fellowship. The high art of promoting worship has yet to be considered seriously in evangelical churches. Probably no exercise of the church might contribute more to mortals than a genuinely sacred hour of communion with the invisible sources of personal peace, social poise, and redemptive power, providing that communion is rooted in the interests and well-being of this mundane sphere. The technique of worship should occupy a chief chair in the synagogue of study.

Christian forces are championing an increasing number of schools. It is a real question whether they are not adding "school" machinery *ad infinitum* without any very marked increase in religious returns or in coordinated activity. Readers are familiar with the Sunday School, the Church Vacation School, the Week-Day School of Religion, the School of Missions, the Catechetical or Church-membership School, the Community Training-school, the Summer Institute for Christian Workers, and so on. To side-track these potentially invaluable institutions of Christianity in seminary training is to give men the illusive impression that this world may be saved by the orations of the preacher or evangelist. As civilization is moving it is likely men are to be moved less and less by the pleadings or petitions of the homilist. Most adults, except the crowd-minded, are beyond the power of radical change under

the spell of the hortatory word. They are inclined to frequent conversions in genuine forums and classroom conferences. Children and youth are subject to distinct guidance under the administration of standard educational work. The minister who would be reproductive in his professional endeavors will give much time, training, and laboratory effort to the schools of the church. Historically, untutored laymen and women, whose one saving grace often was their consecration, have carried this load. The time is ripe when church schools must have normal-trained faculties and high-grade departmental equipment; they must sponsor most approved educational theory, and, climactically, be suffused with a high-minded Christian devotion, in order to win a place in the competition of contemporary school systems.

A very important church movement is its missionary project. Few interests in the national administration of denominations call for larger investment of manhood and money. Very obviously the seminary will not treat this aspect of parish life as insignificant. A place will be provided in curricular program for the investigation of mission history, methods of Christian propaganda, present-day clashes of world cultures and ideals, the rights of indigenous Christians to work out their own philosophy of religion and sect. Such major questions in current Christian strategy cannot be shelved in the seminary without pronounced loss of statesmanship in the denomination and of world-mindedness in the local parish.

Provision should be made for a consideration of methods of promoting religion in church, home, and community. The simple frugal fare of the grandparents in matters religious is utterly inadequate to commend the regard of this generation of folks. Aggressive churchmen are ferreting out every conceivable suggestion to release the religious motive in the complicated and heated business of contemporary living. Such agencies of science as the radio, electric lighting schemes, skyscraper hotel-churches; such institutions of advertising as the

public press, the wayside pulpit, the magazine page; such tricks of the trade as Rotary and Kiwanis use to provoke face-to-face relations of loyalty and consolidation; such leaves of experience from the stage as the use of drama, pageantry, and choral exercises; the features of the game, the dance, and other play orders—all have been commissioned in effort to capitalize human energy for religious ends. The church is testing religion by both precept and project. The individual does not necessarily transfer the spirit of Jesus from the classroom study of the Scriptures to the workaday world in which he forges his selfhood. Can men teach religion, or must they provide ways and means in churches and parishes for religion to be lived in order to be learned? The seminary vocationally bent will give its men introduction to such experiments as are proving valid in releasing and multiplying the productivity of social religion.

At least one more subject requires attention. The aims of the church in the life of society are becoming an ever more fascinating issue. Resolutions of national conventions or historical encyclicals of sects are insufficient to define the objectives of Christianity. How shall men meet more favorably the problem of relation of Church and State? Who has best tempered the attitude of the *ecclesia* toward youth revolt, law enforcement, lotteries? What skills promise most for justice in industry or democracy in racial and class systems? When shall men learn, and learn to curb, the international forces of trade and diplomacy that lead to brute war? To presume that once folks are Christians these diverse questions will take care of themselves is to repudiate social responsibility in religious faith and to resolve Christianity into a benighted selfishness. To assume that there are self-evident Christian principles, the application of which would clear away all local and universal human shortcomings, is to hide behind a visionary and intellectualistic religious rôle, which industrial, political and recreational exploiters may well laugh at as they pursue their nefa-

rious traffic in mortals. The sooner Christians recognize that they possess no utopia for the ills of the world the better. A beautiful message or a pious prayer will not perform the saving miracle. Men must begin by living and laboring as Jesus did. They must commit their adventurous souls to work out practical policies of human redemption, which win approval as they actually accomplish the divine ends for which they were intended. No seminary chooses to be a quack doctor or a silent onlooker in this gloriously dangerous world-wrestle for moral supremacy. The training-school of the churchman resolves to be prophetic and engineering in this big business. Courses of study will therefore be offered in which men are brought face to face with the vital issues in local, larger, and world communities through which humans are in process of carving out their destiny. And all of the resources of history and intelligence will be commandeered to set in action powers of personality to disintegrate the forces of evil and to liberate the fruits of the spirit of good-will, justice, and harmony within the human family.

AN ANABAPTIST POET AND DREAMER

Professor BERTHA W. CLARK
Chicago, Ill.

All the poetry and romance of religion came to a head in Hans Hut; and probably the world never needed the note of poetry and romance in its religion more than it did in Hut's day. It was the exuberant imagination and glowing optimism of such men as he, who when things were blackest could see them brightest, and who when the cause of justice had suffered its bitterest defeat, could confidently proclaim it on the eve of its greatest triumph, that did more to rally the common people of Germany from the despair into which they had been plunged at the close of the Peasant War than did any of the preachers of facts, as they really were, that the age produced. Hut did not lie; in a sense he did not deceive. He led his followers into a glorious world of religious fantasy in which the multitudinous ills of the material world were forgotten for gazing on the glories of the spiritual, one that transcended and enveloped all. It is only the poet who can thus make vivid and real the world of his dreams, and Hans Hut was a poet even when he did not express himself in meter. Sometimes, however, he wrote verses, as well.

Like other poets, Hut was born to the part. He had the passionate, restless soul of the idealist. In his earlier years he was always searching for the truth, always traveling somewhere trying to get light. He gave up his fixed position as sacristan to Hans of Bibra and became an itinerant bookbinder and bookseller, and, it would seem, for the mere sake of getting where men were who made books, and especially such books as were changing world-thought. He was at Wittenberg, where Luther was; at Nürnberg, where Denck was; at Frankenhausen, where Münzer was; and at Augsburg, to be a second time with Denck. He learned much at the feet

of all these men, and perhaps still more from the mystics of the Middle Ages. He was himself a mystic in the fullest sense of the word. The only relationship he could conceive of between man and God was the direct and personal one. He could find no place for rites or ceremonies or formal services, and the first instance of his life that has been recorded is of his refusing to allow his child to be baptized and of his suffering imprisonment therefor.

Until the time of Münzer's death, Hut seems to have had no pronounced views on militarism. He was with Münzer at the fatal battle of Frankenhausen, though he was allowed to go free after the battle under the plea that he had been there in the capacity of bookseller and not of soldier. A little later, however, he was urging the common people at Bibra to rise and slay their magistrates. Then he was with Denck at Augsburg, was baptized by him, and fell deeply under his influence. He now became a pacificist, though his pacifism was of a unique type. Everything Hut did was individualistic. His pacifism was blended with his interpretation of the Scriptures, and his interpretation of the Scriptures was peculiarly his own.

In those days every one was reading the Bible. It was but two generations since the printing-press had been invented, making possible the duplication and wide dissemination of books; yet already nineteen complete translations of the Bible had been published in German, besides twenty-two editions of the Psalms and twenty-five of the Epistles—so eagerly men were studying the Word of God now that they could have it in their own hands. To each group of men it seemed a different book. The social reformers of Switzerland and men like Carlstadt in Germany read the Gospels and Acts to discover the Scripture program of social justice. Preachers like Hübmaier read for light on the organization of the apostolic church. Blaurock selected the passages that dealt with the method of individual conversion. Erasmus and his great following sought out the philosophy of Christ in the chapters of the Ser-

mon on the Mount, that they might draw parallels between the teachings of Jesus and those of the great pagan philosophers. Luther emphasized Paul as he developed his favorite idea of justification by faith. Hut differed from all these. What he loved most was descriptions of heavenly glories, of visions and ecstasies; a rich symbolism of language that for its interpretation drew one above the world of cold reason and called for the loftiest flights of imagination. It was in the Apocalypse and in the Old Testament prophets that he found his richest treasure-stores, and in these he reveled, and especially in the Book of Daniel.

Hut had, too, to a rare degree the gift of eloquence. He was only a lay preacher; but he could bring the hid treasures he had unearthed in a vividly fascinating way before the crowds of men to whom he spoke. The power he exercised over such audiences seems little short of miraculous. Indeed, there were rumors widely spread among the common people to the effect that he made use of some magic potion by which to spellbind his listeners, and other legends grew up about his supernatural accomplishments. It was understood that he had in his possession a book given by God himself to the prophet Daniel.

And Hut did little to disillusion his admirers. He seems almost to have himself believed that he was gifted with occult powers. He was convinced that God spoke to him in just the way He had spoken to prophets in the olden times. He understood mysteries revealed to no one else. He drew up a plan for the final judgment and the resurrection, giving minute details. In a highly popular book called "The Seven Seals" he gave an exposition of the book of Daniel, claiming that a special understanding of the meaning of this book had been vouchsafed to him. His so great confidence in himself and in the truth of his views strengthened the confidence of others in him.

Now in the last chapter of Daniel Hut found these words:

And from the time that the continual burnt offering shall be taken away and the abomination that maketh desolate shall be set up there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. But go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest and shalt stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

Hut showed that the abomination of desolation was the Peasants' War, and that from the end of that struggle to the setting up of Christ's kingdom on earth would be a matter of 1,290 days, or only three and a half years, and that then all the saints should reign with Christ in glory and see their enemies trampled under their feet. To men who had just emerged from the awful experiences of 1525, who had seen their companions slain by thousands, and who were themselves now living in exile in the utmost degradation and with the future only a great blackness, such a message as Hut's became a source of hope and comfort that can hardly be described. And because it was the only hope, men seized on it with an almost frantic eagerness.

Closely tied up with these chiliastic dreams were Hut's ideas on pacifism. The children of God must not fight. Indeed, there would be no need for them to do so; others would fight for them. At the appointed time a host would appear from somewhere without and would destroy all the godless from the face of the earth. In some miraculous way the true believers would be preserved during the days of slaughter, and then Christ would appear and summon his saints to come forth to reign with him for a thousand years. All the children of God need do was to wait quietly till these things should come to pass. This was Hut's message. As in earlier days he had gone wandering from place to place seeking the truth, so now he set out on even more ardent wanderings to share the truth that he had found: and everywhere there was a welcome. He went all over Germany, to Upper and Lower Austria, the Tyrol, Silesia, Styria, Moravia. With the single exception of Thomas

Münzer, there was probably no preacher of his time whose personal influence was felt through so wide a territory as was that of Hut. It would seem that he directed his message always to the common people, but that he constantly drew into his circle also men who were highly educated from among both the clergy and the laity. His preaching was a wild-fire thing and swept everything before it. Anabaptist records recount how often a few hours would suffice for Hut to enter a new town, preach, and organize a church so firmly grounded in his views that in the months and years ahead its members stood the test of the bitterest persecutions.

There were, however, those among the Brethren who opposed Hut, and especially was this true of Hübmaier. Hut's visit to Hübmaier's church was highly sensational. The congregation was made up largely of Anabaptist exiles who within the past year had fled from the persecution that was sweeping Switzerland and South Germany. Many of them were eager to see their long dream realized of living with community of goods and of taking a definite and outspoken stand against war. The pastor, however, was inclined to be conservative; and, besides, the church had already admitted to its membership the two lords of Lichtenstein, who governed the territory where the Brethren had settled and who could not possibly be expected to look favorably on either communism or pacifism. Into this situation Hut came, late in 1526, with all his fiery eloquence and all his outspoken convictions on war, private property, and the millennium. In the shortest possible time he captured the hearts of the congregation and precipitated a crisis.

At just the time Hut arrived the Turks were making a series of depredations and were approaching Moravia, in which country Hübmaier's church was situated. The lords of Lichtenstein were exerting themselves to the utmost to raise and equip an army; and Hut was standing in the big hospital building preaching to a host of people that it was wicked for any

Christian either to bear arms or to pay "blood-money" to send others. He was saying, too, that the Turks were surely the chosen instrument in the hand of God who should destroy the godless from the face of the earth, clearing the way for the setting up of the Kingdom of Christ; and that in two years all would have been accomplished and the saints be reigning in great glory.

To the lords of Lichtenstein this was treason, and Hübmaier was taxed to the utmost to meet the emergency. He gathered the congregation together again and gave his own interpretation of Daniel's prophecy. He explained that Daniel's "days" were not days in the ordinary sense, but that each day was equivalent to a year. According to his interpretation, the destruction of the godless would come not after 1,290 days, but after 1,290 years. There was nothing alarming to the Lichtensteins in Hübmaier's view, but it failed to grip the congregation as Hut's had done, and the antiwar sentiment spread. Unable to control the situation in any other way, the Lichtensteins seized Hut and shut him up in the tower.

Then indeed there was consternation and commotion in the Church of the Brethren. They had been imprisoned at the hands of the Emperor and of Princes and City Councils, of Lutherans, Catholics, and Zwinglians; but that a Brother should be imprisoned by a Brother was past comprehension. It would be hard to conjecture what the end would have been had not a basket and rope mysteriously appeared at Hut's prison window that night affording him the opportunity to escape from the tower and the country, much to the relief of governor and pastor.

After Hut left Moravia Hübmaier published a series of resolutions which have come down to our day in various groupings and phraseology under the name of The Nikolsburg Articles. Hübmaier said they were written by Hut, and Hut vigorously denied the charge. Whether they were written by him or not, they are of extreme interest as showing the ten-

dency to break away from traditional teaching that was manifesting itself in his time. Some of the articles are as follows:

The gospel should not be preached publicly in churches, but only in the ear and in houses.

Christ was conceived in sin.

Christ was not God, but a prophet to whom the speech or word of God had been committed.

Christ did not do enough to atone for the sins of the whole world.

Among Christians there should be no use of violence, nor any magistracy.

The angels were conceived with Christ and incarnated with him.

Whoever has not acknowledged the Lord should not be baptized.

Whoever is clothed with an office cannot be blessed. Men should refrain from being magistrates.

Satan and the godless will finally come to the blessed state.

The Scriptures were not given for believers but for unbelievers, that they might be confounded.

In two years the Lord will come from heaven and deal with the worldly princes, and the godless shall be rooted out, but the godly and elect shall rule with the Lord upon the earth.

All the learned and those skilled in the Scriptures are perverters of the Scriptures.

In the Lord's Supper are only bread and wine. Nothing else is there.

God strengthen thee with his countenance.

The year that followed Hut's visit to Moravia saw him at the height of his popularity. He was named with Denck and Hübmaier as one of the chief leaders of the Anabaptist movement. At the great Synod of the Brethren held in Augsburg in 1527 he and Denck were the dominating figures. Though friends, the two men stood for very opposite policies of church development, and this difference seems to have caused some embarrassment at the synod, with the final decision in favor of Denck's views.

Swiftly after this the end came. Hut was arrested by the authorities and imprisoned at Augsburg. He grew weary of his long confinement, and thinking that in the confusion of a general conflagration he might win a chance for freedom,

he set fire to his cot and so to the building. The guard did not discover the flames till Hut was so badly burned that after eight days he died.

The court that had been looking forward to trying his case would not be cheated of its victim. The dead body was brought to the council chamber, tried, failed to acquit itself of the charges preferred against it, and so condemned to death by burning at the stake; and the sentence was carried out. In this gruesomely tragic manner the story of Hans Hut ends.

The year 1528 passed, and the millennium did not come. Yet one doubts whether the people of Nikolsburg and the other places where Hut had preached were greatly surprised at the outcome. They loved their poet, and they thoroughly understood him. When he preached the pacifism and the community of goods in which they had long believed, his sermons served to strengthen them in their resolve to put their ideals into practise. When he preached the near setting-up of the Kingdom of God on earth, in which they had never believed, they listened courteously, enthusiastically even, and when he was gone promptly forgot what he had said. The story of the Moravian church in all the years that followed shows not a trace of any chiliastic dreaming.

But, for all that, Hut's flights of fancy had brought a glamor into life that helped to tide over one of the sharpest crises of history.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND CRITICAL NOTES

NOTES ON THE FOURTH CENTURY CHURCH OF NISIBIS (MESOPOTAMIA)—A STUDY OF EARLY ORIENTAL CHURCH POLITY

The student of the archæology of the smaller Oriental Churches of the second and following centuries is very much in the same position as the early Californian gold-seekers. He is laboring in a new and unexplored country; he occasionally discovers traces that may lead to a rich find of gold, and he frequently comes upon a pocket that yields a small supply of valuable material and then most disappointingly proves itself exhausted. In this case the first clue was discovered in the library of a Maronite Convent in Hermon, and led through the Vatican Library to the uncatalogued manuscripts of the Societie Orientale at Alexandria, and thence accidentally from the monumental work of the Assemammis to the British Museum and the University of Cambridge. The results of these scattered notes are now presented to the reader for what they are worth. They do not profess to be an authoritative historical study, but they do, I believe, give an accurate account *of the working of a church sixteen hundred years ago.*

The city or town of Nazibina or Nisibis, now Nazabin, is situated in the north of Mesopotamia, where the river Jaghjagher debouches into the plains, and contains a large Christian and Jewish population. It is still the seat of two bishoprics and contains an ancient church of the Jacobites, dedicated to St. James and dating back to the fifth century. In its time it has been a fortress, a treasure-house, and the abode of kings, and even now retains traces of its former grandeur. Early in the second century we find traces of a flourishing Christian church, stated on vague legendary authority to have been founded by Nicodemus after his baptism by St. Peter,

which seems to have been mainly Jewish in its membership, and also seems to have retained a considerable admixture of Jewish ritual.[1]

This is corroborated by Brandt, who quotes as his authority Elias bar Shenayah, Bishop of Nisibis about 1000 A. D., whose Chronicle professes to give the authentic traditions of the church from A. D. 25. Elias states that Nicodemus, having been baptized by the apostle Peter, fled to Nisibis accompanied by a company of Christian Jews and became the founder of a church which, after an independent existence of some three hundred years, was absorbed into the Nestorian Church. It is with the polity of this early Church of Nicodemus that we are dealing in this article.

Like most of these traditionary origins the story of its foundation by Nicodemus probably possesses a grain of truth. There was a strong community of Jews in Nisibis at a very early date in the Christian era, and these were almost certain to have received the Christian tradition either wholly or in part, and there is no reason why Nicodemus should not have been among them. Thomas of Marga says he fled to Persia accompanied by "his companions," and Nisibis was at one time part of the Persian empire. Anyway, the tradition rests on very much stronger grounds than better-known legends which appear to have been generally accepted, notably the presence of Joseph of Arimathea in England or of St. Mark in Ireland.

In the Maronite Convent of Mount Hermon was an interesting composite manuscript containing the letters of one Thomas bar Wahabi to the Christians of Nisibis concerning the state of the church. These letters must from internal evidence have been written about A. D. 250. They have been edited with notes by the well-known Austrian Orientalist Heinrich von Hugel in the Proceedings of the International Society for the Study of Oriental Literature in 1904, and in a pamphlet by myself in the following year. They are interesting from a

[1] Dieudonne, *Le Christianisme dans l'Orient*, tom. VII, Bruxelles, 1809.

Baptist standpoint as showing that the doctrines and practises of this primitive church were almost identical with our own, except for the retention of certain Jewish rites.

The constitution of the church was precisely similar to any Baptist church of today, consisting of an elder or presbyter, deacons, and admitted church-members. The catechumens or candidates for church-membership were only allowed to participate in part of the services, and were apparently under the spiritual charge of a church official whose title may be translated as " Master of the Neophytes " and whose functions seem to have been borrowed intact from the Mithraic Lodges so prevalent in the East.[2]

The presbyter was called upon the vote of the deacons and submitted to the church meeting for confirmation. In things spiritual he seems to have been to all intents and purposes autocratic, and to have received some kind of ordination, whether episcopal or not is hard to ascertain. I incline to the belief that the imposition of hands by either an apostle or one who had personally known the apostles was a regular custom of the early ages of the church, but fell into disuse as the personal tradition grew weak.[3] The administration of baptism, the anointing of the sick, and the administration of the Lord's Supper certainly appertained to him alone. The third Epistle of Thomas bar Wahabi deals eloquently on the plight of a church deprived of the services of its pastor through internal dissension. He points out, however, that there is no appeal to a higher power, and implores both parties to listen to reason or to call a council of the churches to advise what can be done. This eliminates the idea of a bishop having authority over either pastor or people, but not of a central ordaining authority. The keeping of a bishop without any ecclesiastical authority for ordaining purposes only was common in the Eastern and

[2] Von Harnack, *Gesch. Eccles. Syriac,* Bremen, 1737.

[3] Tertullian, *De exhortation Castitatis,* 9; Ephraim of Edessa, Chronicles, XI, 12; " Book of Heraklides," Bedham, 1904.

Irish churches.[4] Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that the pastor of Nisibis claimed a spiritual authority from some source superior to the elders of the church, and that the church recognized this authority although maintaining their right to dictate in things material. A certain Eleazar was brought before the church and found guilty of fornication and deprived of church-membership by the deacons. The deacons being satisfied of his repentance decided to readmit him to membership and instructed the presbyter to absolve him to this end. The presbyter refusing, they readmitted him to membership but not to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper until the absolution had been formerly pronounced. Here we have the church recognizing the formula of absolution but apparently imposing the penance. I believe this state of things to be unique in church history. The matter was ended by the presbyter, Isaac of Edessa, giving way under protest. The point is this: Did the church recognize the power of apostolic orders in the Roman sense, or did they look upon the presbyter in his official position symbolizing the power of the church to bind and loose, and representing their collective authority? I incline personally to the latter belief. It is distinctly stated "that the presbyter in his person combines all the functions of the corporate body of Christ and that though a Pastor can fulfil all the duties of a church, a church cannot fulfil the function of a Pastor." [5] It would appear therefore that in the early days of the Eastern Churches the presbyter combined in his person and executed the functions of the entire church-membership, including the power of the keys in its widest sense. Four of the members appear to have resented the attitude of the presbyter in the case of Eleazar and to have withdrawn their financial support from the pastor. The remainder of the church, although themselves not agreeing with his line of action, sus-

[4] Herzog-Hauk, *Realencyklopadie*, Bischof; Joann Morinus. *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, 1655; G. T. Stokes, "Ireland and the Celtic Church"; J. Healy, "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars."

[5] Patrologia, Graffin, I, 742.

pended them from membership until they had made restitution.[6] The function of the Diaconate seems to have been purely administrative. They are frequently referred to as "initiates" and I think that the Mithraic system had a much larger share in the development of the polity of the Oriental Churches than has hitherto been recognized. They seem to have almost certainly gone through some secret initiation before assuming office and on transferring to another church to have retained their position.[7]

They called the presiding presbyter, were in sole charge of the finances, exercised disciplinary functions, administered all relief and were independent of all control except that of the general church meeting. A peculiar phrase is used by Ibas of Edessa in referring to them as "those who penetrate the arcana of the sanctuary" and seems to confirm the theory of a secret initiation.[8] I remember seeing in the library of the Oriental College at Alexandria a manuscript containing fragments of the ceremony of the making of deacons in a third-century church, but the notes I made have disappeared, and I can hardly quote from memory. If I recollect rightly, the candidates fasted for two days, were ceremonially shaved, clad in new garments, and then taken to the church and solemnly ordained by the presbyter in the presence of their fellow deacons. This is distinctly paralleled in the Mithraic initiations. It must be remembered that Mithraism was a Persian cult, and that the majority of these sects were of Persian origin. As many of the ceremonies of the Roman Church were candidly borrowed from classical paganism it is not too much to look for similar traces in the smaller Oriental communities. This would also account for the many Gnostic traces we find in their theology. This view is shared by Cardinal Moroni as appears from his rare works on Gnosticism published in Florence about

[6] Thomas bar Wahabi, op. cit., 14.

[7] *Patrologia Orientalis*, II, 2, Paris, 1906.

[8] Duval. *Litt. Syriac*, p. 641.

1740, and of which I believe a copy exists in the Library of Cambridge University.

One of the deacons appears to have filled the modern function of church clerk, and an important part of his duty was to write the letters to different churches which form such an important item in the material for early Oriental research. Continual correspondence was maintained between churches throughout the East. We have letters from Edessa to the Thomists of Malabar and from Damascus to the church community in Nisibis. They deal with every conceivable subject from theology to finance. The larger churches through their reputation and prestige undoubtedly exercised a large amount of moral control over their smaller brethren, and from this custom probably arose the system of centralized authority that culminated in the powers of the episcopal system. The diaconate seems at Nisibis, at any rate, to have concentrated in itself the governing functions of the church in administrative matters, while the presbyter retained the outward signs of spiritual administration.

The church was composed of the body of baptized believers who met once a month to indorse the policy of the deacons and to hear the letters read from other churches. These letters, when of exceptional interest, were kept in the church archives and in time acquired a local standing almost equal to the canonical Scriptures. Thomas in his third letter deprecates the custom of canvassing the members and gives some interesting side-lights on the church meeting. He says the members should not discuss the affairs of the church in public, should not allow their private prejudices to sway their judgment, and should only cast their vote secretly and after prayer for guidance—excellent advice which might with much profit be impressed on our church-members of today. The deacons had a system of quartering strangers and visitors from other churches upon the members, the poorer brethren being recompensed from the church chest. A tax of a tenth of their income

was imposed and collected by a regularly appointed officer, failure to meet the obligation being met with suspension, the arbitrary action of the deacons in this respect being one of the causes of the trouble that led to the letters of Thomas.

The ordinance of baptism was solemnly administered three times a year at Pentecost, Easter, and the Epiphany. The ceremony is described in some detail by John of Nisibis, c. 250.[9] The catechumens after a solemn and protracted fast were gathered at the church door and then facing the west made a solemn renunciation of their former errors. The reciting of the creed is not mentioned. A solemn anointing with oil followed, the candidates then proceeding to the place of baptism and being triply immersed with the usual formula; both sexes entered the water *in puris naturabilis*. The clothing in white garments followed and on the return to the church the newly baptized were admitted to the celebration of the Lord's Supper and offered in addition honey and milk. These ceremonies are closely paralleled by the Mithraic lustrations,[10] and go further to point to the probability of Mithraic influences in the early churches of the East. The ordinance of the Supper was probably more of the nature of a meal. Thomas bar Wahabi speaks of "being seated at the table of the Lord," while Pliny the Younger in his celebrated letter refers to "the eating of a harmless meal." [11]

The unction of the sick appears to have been performed in the church and to have been a regular part of the public service.

Circumcision, as might be expected in a congregation of Jewish converts, was compulsory as it is among the Abyssinian Christians at the present day. An ark and scrolls of the Law were also part of the furnishings.

The main points about this ancient community seem to have been:

[9] Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, lib. VIII, Rome, 1726.
[10] Albert Dietrich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, Leipzig, 1903.
[11] Pliny, Letters, XCVII.

1. The retention of various Jewish rites and ceremonies for years after the rest of the church had abandoned them. This can be accounted for by the fact that they were a purely Jewish community, isolated from the main body of the church, and communicating only with similar bodies.

2. The Mithraic influences evident in their ceremonies. This can easily be explained. Mithraic lodges were everywhere in the East, and while a religion in a sense, was also a secret society very similar to our Freemasonry. In times of persecution it was inevitable that the smaller Christian churches should assume the character of a secret organization and that they should adopt the ritual of the society which they knew best.[12]

3. The insistence on the individual responsibility of the individual while retaining the spiritual supremacy of the presbyter. This is unique among the Oriental churches, although still prevalent in the Orthodox Greek Church. The writer remembers seeing a Russian priest convicted and fined for immorality. After abusing him violently for some minutes as a disgrace to the church, the magistrate and the court rose for the prisoner's blessing. We have here a distinct separation of the man from his office.

4. The baptismal rite as a preliminary to church-membership but with no belief in its regenerative power.

5. The extremely modern and efficient methods of church organization.

The study of these small and autonomous Eastern churches has been far too much neglected and is extremely valuable not only from its archæological interest but as showing that Baptist principles were predominant in the early church, and although covered over by later ecclesiastical influences, remained dormant in the church until awakened by the great spiritual upheaval which culminated in the Reformation.

I hope to deal with the much vexed question of the theology of these smaller churches of the East at a future date, if and when the Lord calls me to a field containing a library and with access to some works of reference. I have forwarded this paper in the hope that some of my brethren may care to take up this line of research and bring to light the unexplored treasures of the post-apostolic ages.

JOHN CROSBY.

[12] Franz Cumont, *Textes et monuments figures relatifs aux mysteres de Mithras*, Bruxelles, 1899.

SOME TRADITIONAL MISINTERPRETATIONS

Pulpit tradition, like traditions in every sphere, is very strong and persistent. This is true—from pulpit tones that are heard nowhere else, to interpretations of Scripture passages that have been handed down from generation to generation through preaching. It is proposed in successive short articles in the Quarterly to point out some of the numerous misinterpretations that have been passed along, because the preacher has not taken the pains to look carefully into the meaning of the passages in question.

Here we may call to mind two supposedly Messianic passages often misused in the past. In both of these cases the currently accepted versions are partly to blame. As the later translations become more widely used, the traditional interpretations will doubtless disappear altogether.

The first of these is in Haggai 2 : 7. Here the Vulgate has *et veniet desideratus gentibus,* and King James, "The desire of all nations shall come." This "desire," this "desired one" was, of course, interpreted as the coming Messiah, who was the One for whom the peoples of the world unconsciously yearned. The learned Archbishop Trench, in his famous Hulsean lectures entitled, "Christ, the Desire of All Nations, or the Unconscious Prophesyings of Heathendom," gave wide currency to this interpretation. Richard Fuller, the eloquent Southern preacher, had a great sermon on "Christ, the Desire of All Nations."

A careful examination both of the text and of the context makes this interpretation quite untenable, however beautiful and however true the fact may be that Jesus Christ is the need of the nations. The Hebrew word rendered "desire" is feminine singular, and therefore might be translated "the desire"; but the verb following is plural. Literally, "the desire of all nations, they shall come." The Septuagint accordingly has the rendering "the choice things (*τὰ ἐκλεκτά*) of all

nations shall come"; and most modern English versions carry this sense; Moffatt, "The treasures of all nations." This of course fits also with the context, which represents all peoples paying tribute to Jehovah by bringing their silver, their gold, etc., to enrich his temple, so that "the glory of this latter house [Zerubbabel's] shall be greater than the former [Solomon's], saith Jehovah of hosts."

One may here be diverted long enough to refer to a similar mistranslation in 1 Peter 2 : 7: "Unto you . . . is he precious," A. V. Quite true is it that to those who believe, Christ is precious, but here a feminine singular (ἡ τιμή) precludes this rendering: "To you who believe is the *preciousness*" of the (precious) corner-stone laid as a solid foundation for the believer's faith. This corner-stone is Jesus Christ (ver. 3ff.). Moffatt here reads, rather loosely, "Now you believe, you hold him 'precious'"; while Goodspeed interprets, "It is you, therefore, who believe, who see its (the stone's) value." But one may ask whether the idea is not, "*belongs* its value"? While Canterbury, Am. Standard and others render ἡ τιμή by "preciousness," Broadus, Weston and Hovey (Am. Bap. Pub. Soc.) give the more common meaning "the honor." So that the thought would be, the stone that was "elect, honored," of God by being placed at the head of the corner, becomes to the believer, a *possession of honor*.

A second Old Testament passage, traditionally regarded as having a personal Messianic reference, is Genesis 49 : 10. It has been commonly rendered, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . until *Shiloh* come." But inasmuch as Shiloh is always a place and not a person, in the Old Testament; and since Shiloh makes no clear sense in the passage as a whole, it is almost certain that the ordinary Masoretic text is here corrupt. This judgment is made the more sure by the fact that LXX, the Vulgate, the Syriac, and Jewish Targums evidently had a different reading than Shiloh. By a slight change in the Hebrew letters, the rendering of these ancient

versions may easily be accounted for, so that the sense would become, either, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . until the things reserved for him come," or less probably, "until he come who has been sent" (Jerome), or, "till he comes, to whom it belongs." This last would give the same thought as is found in a Messianic passage in Ezekiel 21 : 27, "until he come whose right it is."

E. B. Pollard.

NOTES AND CURRENT DISCUSSIONS

We are here giving a brief estimate of one of the truly able preachers of our day. Among the twenty-five living ministers esteemed the greatest in a widely advertised poll was George W. Truett, of Dallas, Texas. He was the only preacher living in the South to be included in the list, although several others of them were of Southern birth. The inclusion of Doctor Truett in the number was all the more a testimony to this preacher's pulpit power, since relatively few of those voting were from the Southern section of the country. Similar articles have appeared in previous issues of the Quarterly, in which appreciative estimates have been made of other prominent living ministers who are recognized as among our most successful men in pulpit power. The article which follows is written by the Reverend Professor L. O. Dawson, D. D., for about three decades pastor in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and now occupying the Bible Chair in Howard College, Birmingham.

SOME ELEMENTS OF POWER IN THE PREACHING OF GEORGE W. TRUETT

It is hard to give a calm, judicial estimate of the elements of power in a man one loves with a deep personal devotion, but I believe almost any man who knows George Truett would agree that each one of those who have the privilege of his friendship, feels he is one of the very special friends of the great preacher. I have that feeling. You would have it if you knew him. His sympathy for mankind is so great that without effort and without cant he makes you think that he is especially interested in *you*. You believe him. You believe in him. Your confidence in his own personal integrity, sincerity, transparent honesty, and goodness of soul, is a golden key that opens for him the door of your heart, and his every word has

ready entrance to the inner sanctuary of your soul and obtains there its utmost weight.

He preaches a great gospel, sufficient for the utmost needs of every suffering heart. And there are no question-marks in it. He believes in it to the tips of his fingers and to the ends of his toes.

"Mr. Truett," asked a young student, harassed with all manner of doubt, "may I depend on what you said tonight? Do you know that to be true?" "Young friend," replied the great prophet, "you may absolutely stretch your soul on that. I have put it to the test and know beyond the peradventure of a doubt that it is true." Convinced himself, his every accent falls with resistless force on the heart already open to receive his word.

He is tremendously in earnest. He does not rant. I do not recall that I ever saw a tear in his eyes, but with a voice like a trumpet, a face flaming with fire, a stalwart body glowing with vital energy, and his whole personality surrendered to the power of the Holy Spirit, he pours out his message, an irresistible torrent, upon his audience. You feel, you know that he is not thinking of himself, or of the quality of his sermon. You feel, you know, that he is not concerned with the making, or maintenance of a reputation, or with the sort of impression he is making, except as he is consumed with the desire that you may be impressed to accept his Lord and his gospel.

He is a specialist, a preacher—just that, with no ambition or desire to do, or be anything else. His great church shields him from administrative cares. Devoted friends are affectionate shock-absorbers who keep distractions from diverting him from his one supreme purpose. He is not one-sided, or cranky, but a well-poised, safe, sane man of God—a good citizen and neighbor deeply concerned in all that makes for the welfare of community and country. But still a preacher. Just that and no more.

He is not in any sense an actor. He rarely moves out of his tracks while speaking; but he has great dramatic power. From the rich stores of human experience, his own and that of thousands of others who have bared to him their hearts, he selects simple incidents illustrating the truth he is expounding and makes them live and throb again for your help. Told by others these experiences might not impress you. Leaping from his golden tongue, they break your heart, or lift you to the sky.

His message is so simple that you are surprised to know he is a great student. His church sets aside a large sum of money every year to buy books for him. He reads them, digests them, empties them into the reservoir of his mind, leaves them there, and preaches his simple message. They go into his mill as economics, sociology, psychology, and all the rest. They come out a story of divine love that can redeem, and is redeeming a lost world.

The common people hear him gladly, and under his preaching the great ones of the earth become like little children again, and as such, enter into the kingdom of heaven with exceeding great joy.

L. O. Dawson.

The death of Professor William Romaine Newbold, Ph. D., LL. D., since 1889 a member of the Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, on September 26, 1926, is a great loss to scholarship. Though primarily active in the field of philosophy, his interests were not confined to his particular specialty. For many years he was a member of the American Oriental Society, the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, and had long been a student of early Christian history. His classical training and rare ability as a linguist resulted in many contributions to the knotty and perplexed problems of Christian beginnings.

His last work, a lengthy article published in the *American*

Journal of Archæology, Vol. XXX (1926), on "Five Transliterated Aramaic Inscriptions," evidences the wideness of his interest and his ingenuity. These inscriptions—two from Pompeii, three discovered under the ruins of the church of San Sebastino—were apparently in Latin, though one was written in Greek letters. The translation was obscure, if not impossible. Doctor Newbold ventured to treat them as Aramaic imperfectly represented by the Latin and Greek letters, and found them coherent and logical. It is quite possible that the last three of them will cast light on the old tradition that the bodies of Peter and Paul were stolen from Rome but were speedily recovered and for a time were kept in a place called *ad Catacumbas* until they found their final resting-place. Doctor Newbold feels these inscriptions make it plausible that this hitherto unknown *ad Catacumbas* may well have been the site under the church of San Sebastino.

M. S. E.

WHAT'S WHAT IN THE MAGAZINES

THE CHRISTIAN TRAINING OF THE EMOTIONAL LIFE

There is much talk nowadays about the responsibility of the school for educating emotions as well as intellect, for fitting children to adjust to social life as they find it outside the schoolroom, for building character as well as good foundations in the three R's.

THIS principle enunciated by Dr. Jessie Taft in an article "Closed Doors and the Key to Them," in the *Survey,* September 15, 1926, pp. 613-616, is most timely and treats of a long-neglected phase of education. The knowledge theory of education is passing for two reasons: it does not train the whole child, nor does it train intelligence for the best equipment of the whole child. More vital than the individual's knowledge are his desires, wishes, impulses, emotions, feelings, motives, and the like. Personality rather than intelligence is the touchstone in the modern school. "The verbally minded child" may be alert in the classroom but dull in social obligations in home or on street. Activities are being introduced into school curriculum to stimulate "the dynamics of behavior." Some call this new phase of education "mental hygiene." Doctor Taft illustrates the lack of training of the emotional life in describing the problems of a boy, Arthur, and three girls, Esther, Mabel R., and Sara. She also points out how new interests introduced into the school program of these children would correct their social arrest and help them to become highly approved persons in society.

The same perverted training may obtain in pulpit or Sunday schools where major regard is paid to a content of religious instruction. Some ministers and teachers assume that their chief task is to drill the members of the parish in the content of revealed religion. They overlook the primacy of the human factor, and the necessity, if sound Christian edu-

cation is involved, to pitch such materials as they use for, and in the interests of, the particular persons of the parish. As a result the doctrinal factor is overemphasized. The emotional life of the Christian is underfed, and inferior or neglected social responsibilities result. For this reason the "project method," that is, purposeful activity self-initiated and self-directed, is winning wide approval in the newer kind of Sunday schools and general church work. Christians learn the worth and meaning of the Christian life by living as emotional people the way of the Christian life.

S. G. C.

THE TEACHING OF RELIGION BY PROJECT

In *Religious Education* for October one may find a rather full discussion of the topic, "Teaching Religion by Project." Ten years ago the term "project" as applied to education would scarcely have been intelligible even in most educational circles. Today it is one of the major emphases with a growing circle of educators, as is seen from the fact that the *Journal of Religious Education* gives almost the entire issue to this subject.

The project method is based upon such well-known educational principles as that of "interest," and of "learning by doing"; that the *whole* boy, or girl, is being taught, and that character and conduct are major ends of the educational process. Briefly expressed, the project method relies, not upon text-books, or upon curriculum, as commonly understood, but upon the working out of some problem, or the mastering of some real situation, that bears directly and vitally upon the life of the pupil.

In the issue of *Religious Education,* to which we have referred, such questions as, "The Use of the Project Principle in Teaching Religion," "The Emergence of the Project Principle into the Field of Religious Education," "The Origin of Projects," "Idealism, Mechanism, and the Project

Principle," "The Project Principle from the Standpoint of the Curriculum," "Character Building and the Curriculum," "The Teacher and the Project Principle," "Difficulties and Dangers of Project Teaching," "Examples of Project Teaching"—in camping, in the theological seminary curriculum, in college and university, in the church school, in vacation schools, among races—all these are suggestively treated. Mr. E. L. Shaver, in his article, "The Use of the Project Principle," finds in Jesus, the Great Teacher, one of the best examples of this principle:

> Jesus had neither classrooms, nor books, nor equipment. He had no formal classes. He did not cover his material in any prearranged or logical order. He gave no memory work, and set no examinations in our meaning of the term. But day after day, as he and his disciples passed along the highway, or down the village street, they found people in need. Here the need was physical, here mental, here a matter of faith. While he applied himself to the renewing of life, his disciples looked on as observer-students in training. At first they assisted in the minor details; later they are given an opportunity to go out two and two to practise; finally, they were given the entire task with the promise, "Greater things than these shall ye do." . . At times it was a social event they attended; at times it was the sight of a beautiful field of ripening grain; of children at play, or of laborers at work. But whatever happened became for Jesus the occasion of a lesson. No prearranged lectures, text-books, or recitations kept him from using every experience to teach the principles of his better way of life. He had, it is true, some great objectives, such as brotherhood, love of truth, respect for personality, and reverence for the Father. It was through each day's life, however, that these were to be taught, not through books or words. He did talk to his disciples, but his words were interpretations of the experiences through which they were passing.

Unquestionably education has been too theoretical and too far removed from real life. The pupil is not simply preparing for life, he is living, and his association with the teacher should be "a character-making fellowship," in which experiences are brought under purposive control. One may know a text-book thoroughly, may even repeat from memory the Bible from cover to cover, and never learn how to live. A careful study

of these articles in October *Religious Education* will pay every pastor and religious teacher—not omitting the one, "Difficulties and Dangers of Project Teaching."

E. B. P.

THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN RELIGION

UNDER this inviting title Douglas Clyde Macintosh provides an article in the September number of the *Journal of Religion* which is full of interest for the theologically minded.

"We shall be concerned primarily with the question as to *what God is;* only secondarily and somewhat incidentally shall we seek to show *that God is.*" Doctor Macintosh repudiates the pantheistic, and absolute and social idealistic positions of well-known schools of thought. He would champion the tenets of absolute realism. "God is the supreme Power in reality, that upon which we are all ultimately dependent." This elemental axiom of life "moral optimists" postulate as a logical premise. Religiously speaking, this God is the "Conserver of absolute values." Historical Christianity has revealed this One in the morally victorious Jesus.

In Christianity the Ideal Companion is sometimes regarded as "the Christ of Experience," sometimes as the "Comforter," or Paraclete, or Holy Spirit, the same Divine Companion of the inner life as was in Jesus Christ himself.

The writer makes the nexus between this absolute deity and relative man across the bridge of "right religious adjustment," an "adjustment" humanly achieved through a sixfold process of personal discipline. The process is described at considerable length in the author's "Theology as an Empirical Science." Experience leads man to discover that the Cosmic Power, which is God, is holy, that is, spiritual. Men are able to believe that God is absolutely real (Cosmic Power) and at the same time divinely ideal (holy and spiritual) by the "unifying concept of *moral will.*" In "right religious adjust-

ment" the individual substantiates this belief, for he experiences moral salvation of an absolutely dependable character. God is therefore the moral Personality of cosmic proportions.

Doctor Macintosh uses the analogy of the psychological organism to picture the relation God bears to the cosmos. God indwells in the cosmos as spiritual Mind and Will. Sometimes He is more immanent in the activities of the natural order than at other times. This same God may be pictured in relation with men through the analogy of "a spiritual society, of which God is the dominant Spirit, or better, of that of a well-beloved family, of which God is the Father."

S. G. C.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

Professor Luther D. Reed, of the Lutheran Theological Seminary of Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, is among the leading teachers of the theory and practise of public worship. Inasmuch as his emphases are different from those common in many non-liturgical churches, his article will be read with much interest and profit.

Dr. Frank Grant Lewis, Librarian of Crozer Theological Seminary, has made a valuable historical study of the development of the curricula of schools of theology. It will be read with as much zest as it was listened to by those who heard it at Crozer's matriculation exercises.

Professor Ralph W. Nelson has previously written for our columns. In this issue he ably discusses "Experimental Christianity and Rival Religions." It is to be regretted that the entire article cannot appear in this number, since both Christianity's relation to dogma, and its attitude toward other religions are matters of living interest for today.

Professor Stewart G. Cole, of Crozer Seminary, presents a comprehensive study of the place of religious education in the preparation of efficient church administration. It is a subject that every wide-awake minister of today must consider seriously.

Miss Bertha W. Clark, after graduation from George Washington University, spent seven years as missionary in Burma. She holds the master's degree from Columbia, and is now teaching in Chicago. Her interest in the study of certain Anabaptist groups has enabled her to furnish a most interesting article on a striking personality among the Anabaptists.

Doctor John Crosby introduces our readers to another study in early church history, concerning a religious community, in a section of the world interesting because of recent archæological explorations. Doctor Crosby holds degrees from Oxford, Rome, Salonica, and the Catholic University of Washington, D. C.

Doctor L. O. Dawson, who writes concerning his friend, George W. Truett, is a native of Alabama, was for thirty years or more pastor at Tuscaloosa, and is now in the faculty of Howard College, Birmingham. What he says concerning the greatest of living Southern preachers, is discerning.

BOOK REVIEWS

Studies in the Text of the New Testament. A. T. Robertson, M. A., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D., Chair of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New York: George H. Doran Company. (Copyright, 1926.) Pp. 192.

This is really not a book at all, but a group of essays, somewhat related in nature, many of which have been published in religious periodicals. The little editing which apparently has been done to these essays before their reissue has resulted in constant reduplication. Again certain familiarities of style, together with the edifying tone, which might perhaps not have been entirely out of place in informal speech, would better have been omitted before publication. But we can almost forgive this in the light of the modern outlook.

Yet in spite of these blemishes these essays should serve a real purpose. Doctor Robertson here stands as the doughty champion of textual criticism and the resultant modern versions of the English Bible. To those who have been wont to class textual critics along with others who tamper with God's Holy Word, it will come as a surprise to see the intense joy this good conservative finds in discarding such obviously spurious passages as the periodic visits of the angel to the pool of Bethesda (John 5 : 4), the confession of the eunuch (Acts 8:37), and the three witnesses in heaven. (1 John 5:7, 8.)

It must be confessed that along with a sane and fair treatment of textual questions there is an undercurrent of rather fanciful exegesis. Of this the chapter on "Paul and His Books" affords some striking examples. "Keep your mind on the reading" (1 Tim. 4:13), which in line with the context regarding exhortation and teaching can hardly refer to anything except the public reading of the law and prophets in the Christian congregation, as Bengel long since pointed out (*lectioni Scripturæ sacræ in ecclesia*), would seem to be interpreted by the author as encouraging Timothy to studious habits and thus by application as admonishing modern preachers not to let golf and the motor-car interfere with like activity (p. 105). When speaking of the books that Timothy is to bring (2 Tim. 4:3) he concludes, "It is quite possible that one of the books . . . was the Gospel of Mark" (p. 110f). Also he thinks the book-wrap may well have had Luke's presentation copies of the Gospel and the Acts. It is perhaps surprising that Doctor Robertson has not suggested that Peter, to heal the breach between himself and Paul, had probably sent the first

edition of his two epistles with the result that they too were a part of the library that was to be brought by the uncomplaining Timothy.

It is to be regretted that Doctor Robertson's time and strength are so taxed in producing his many books and articles that too often their content does not keep pace with their frequency. Yet in spite of these obvious defects—and the few cited are not exhaustive—this series of essays should tend to remove silly and blind prejudices from the minds of many who perhaps will pay heed to a champion of orthodoxy when they would fail even to read an article from a so-called liberal.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

St. Paul's Life of Christ. GWILYM O. GRIFFITH. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1925. Pp. viii, 288.

IN the course of the last few years many books have been written with such titles as "Jesus According to St. Mark," "The Jesus of History," as well as a host of others using the synoptic Gospels as the sources of knowledge. It has long been a commonplace that the Gospels, at least as we have them, are by no means the earliest of our New Testament writings, but that the letters of Paul are several years, if not decades, earlier than any of our present Gospels. Then why not a book with the title "Jesus According to St. Paul"?

Mr. Griffith has in a measure tried to meet this need. The qualification seems necessary, for after all, the historic facts that Paul has preserved of the life of Jesus are few. Whatever the reasons were, the fact is all too patent when an author seeks to collect them. In Chapter II we have Paul's "Life of Christ in Review." In small type the various sections from the epistles are printed continuously without foot-note to tell the reader whence they come. This confidence of Mr. Griffith in his reader's familiarity with the New Testament is touching. But in these latter days when vituperative passion for the Bible has so largely supplanted elementary knowledge of what it contains, one wonders how many readers will not surreptitiously consult a concordance, or else pass along with the vague conviction that the words sound familiar.

Perhaps the criticism is just and not unfavorable that the title of the book might well have been "St. Paul's Life in Christ." The experience of Paul with his Lord is the central note after all. It is, as Mr. Griffith is fond of telling us, "the great life of Christ written upon Paul's mind and heart," but it is also "the record of Paul's own experience of the Lord of Glory" (p. 153). Nor is this an unimportant contribution. It may perhaps not add much to our meager knowledge of the Teacher in Galilee, but it does reveal the mind of the "one who best understood him."

Acts and the Pastoral Epistles are used as sources. Many words of Jesus, or at least reminiscent notes of the Voice of Galilee, are seen in words which many do not so understand. The words regarding the Last Supper "I received of the Lord," however, are hardly to be interpreted as "I received of tradition," but rather to be regarded as the result of intense and prayerful meditation.

Probably some will feel his insistence upon the need of a greater emphasis on justification by faith than is common today is open to question. Certainly his stalwart defense of Paul's doctrine of imputed righteousness will not be acceptable to all.

But after all, the irenic spirit of the book and the many passages of real insight into that most maligned master-builder (without whom, perhaps the message of Galilee would not have been so changed, yet as probably would never have been heeded) make it a rewarding book.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

Eight Ways of Looking at Christianity. GRANVILLE HICKS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 141.

HERE is something different! For that reason it attracts attention. Attention is held long enough to occasion exclamations and interrogations. And exclamations and interrogations abound in this volume. To evoke these was perhaps one of the aims of the writer. At least the place and persons give that impression. It is a good-natured group that discusses a religion that has had tremendous significance in human history, and probably such discussions will make it more significant. The group consists of cultured gentlemen who have achieved some distinction in local communities. They are the average moderately successful professor and lawyer and physician. They have read James, Leuba, Royce, Rashdall, Bergson, etc. They have a newspaper acquaintance at least with Bishop Lawrence, Gordon, Fosdick, Jefferson, Machen, etc. They know enough of astronomy and biology and psychology to furnish apt illustrations, and suggest digressions in conversation. They are comfortably housed in an out-of-the-way bungalow, where a hearth-fire cheers, and no one can disturb. It appears that each one of the group was able to arrive at his destination in an automobile, presumably his own. In short, it is a holiday gathering for the serious business of discussing religion. Just the ideal place and time to converse about religion either as "a way of life" or "a way of superstition." Under the circumstances it mattered little whether either way had any definite direction.

But it is an interesting group, and many will covet an invitation to

share in the discussion or to be permitted to be eavesdroppers. It is a thoroughly human group, for a Catholic, a fundamentalist, a modernist, a historian, a religious scientist, an agnostic scientist, an English instructor, and an artist, are the characters who compose the holiday party. Of course, these are not meant to be distinct mental or religious "types," for there are Unitarian "fundamentalists" and Catholic "modernists." They are ordinary humans with an intelligent interest in topics of every-day conversation, when the mood is present.

The writer has done an interesting piece of work. He has in a fascinating manner gathered eight of our neighbors to instruct and entertain us. He might have enlarged the company, but that would have destroyed the intimacy of fellowship and the pleasantry of repartee. Maybe in the future he will summon other groups of eight, for Christianity is all-encompassing enough to evoke more than eight exclamations and interrogations. The overarching heavens have done so.

Read the book and enjoy the fascinating companionship of the delightful group the author has summoned to meet you.

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Unity of Faith and Knowledge: Problems of Philosophy and Christian Theism. JOHN A. W. HAAS, President of Muhlenberg College. New York: The Macmillan Company.

HERE is a very creditable attempt to provide a course for college students, which coordinates the varied disciplines. Such a course, in the broad sense philosophical, is sorely needed, as witness the appeal of the students of Harvard College and other institutions for such a discipline as will relate the values of the varied studies.

The sciences are abstractions from the whole; separate specialist interests, vigorously advocated by special pleaders. And this is true of all the elements of the usual curriculum of the college or university. What is the meaning of all these aspects of the world? No mere catalogue of the meanings and values discoverable in each, meanings and values so often singly presented, and as opposed to each other, can be the last answer to the significance they may have for life.

The student may leave college in mental bewilderment and moral confusion (one wonders how it can be otherwise); and apparently little is done to relate these contending facts or inferences to each other, so that they may be considered as an organism, a whole which has or may have meaning for life.

This is what Doctor Haas has done so well,—that is, if one is ready to accept his coordinating principle. But whether one does or not, the

series of chapters is the suggestion of a new discipline, and should lead, probably will, to other equally simple and efficient efforts with the same or other principle of coordination.

Since so much ado is made nowadays about the unsettling effects of collegiate training on students, here would seem to be a corrective; and here is a valuable course to this end, since

> their purpose is to lead both classical and scientific students to a discussion of theistic personalism as a solution of the problem of the unifying of knowledge and faith.

The lectures are presented in the conviction that it is possible to accept the best results of modern learning without becoming agnostic, and "the personalistic philosophy of Christian Theism furnishes the ways and means."

Whether the author succeeds in this unification is another question. It is not necessary to think of these chapters as a demonstration of this unity. Probably Doctor Haas does not. He rather intimates the inadequacy of any one or group of the sciences to meet the demands of faith; and offers his philosophy as the competent to meet each deficiency. He does not find it difficult to show the futility of trying to do justice to all the facts of the world and life, through the numerous inferences, not to say speculations of the sciences; and much less of justice can so be done to what science, as such, pays no attention—*values,* spiritual and moral.

The lectures indeed are a somewhat novel presentation of the theistic arguments, offered not as logical demonstrations; but to show that in view of the insufficient accounting for the universe as a whole, the theistic faith is essential and sufficient. The inherent inadequacies of theism as a philosophy are not considered since no demonstration is sought. Rather there is the inevitable conviction, the moral certainty of one who believes in God on some other ground.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

"Religion in the Making": Lowell Lectures, 1926. ALFRED NORTH WHITEHEAD, Fellow of Trinity College in the University of Cambridge, and Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THIS is one of two books with a common strain of thought and grounded in the same metaphysics. In the one, "Science and the Modern Mind," the thought is applied critically to science and in the other constructively to religion. The books are independent of each other, yet mutually elucidating.

In the reviewer's judgment the outstanding contributions of the book are the essential idea of religion; and the demonstrated claim that religion, if rational, must have recourse to metaphysics.

As to the essential idea of religion,—*Religion is the art and theory of the internal life of man.* Art first, then theory; not, first theory and then art. That is the significant proposition.

Life is an internal fact for its own sake. The internal life is the self-realization of existence. Professor Whitehead will make some folks sit up and take notice with this clear challenge:

> This doctrine is the direct negation of the theory that religion is primarily a social fact. Social facts are of supreme importance to religion, because there is no such thing as absolutely independent existence. You can not abstract society from man: most psychology is herd-psychology. *But* all collective emotions leave untouched the awful ultimate fact, which is the human being consciously alone with itself, for its own sake.

Or again:

> Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness. It runs through three stages, if it evolves to its final satisfaction. It is the transition from God the void to God the enemy, and from God the enemy to God the companion. Thus religion is solitariness; and if you are never solitary you are never religious.

All the rest is temporary expedient.

Religion, so far as it externally expresses itself in human history, shows four sides of itself—ritual, emotion, belief, rationalization. These are not all of equal influence throughout the historical periods. Their emergence is gradual; and it is not until belief and rationalization are well established that solitariness is discernible as constituting the heart of religious importance. Rational religion is the outcome of the emergence of a religious consciousness which is universal, as distinguished from tribal, or even social. Just because it is universal it introduces the note of solitariness, for universality is a disconnection from immediate surroundings.

Religion seeks "something permanent and intelligible by which to interpret the confusion of immediate detail." Christianity, unlike Buddhism, which is essentially a metaphysic generating a religion, has always been a religion seeking a metaphysic. Christianity has retained the easy power of development *for it has first the religion fact.*

So, as to the necessity religion is under to have recourse to metaphysics, especially for a scrutiny of its terms, we note: "The dogmas of religion are the attempts to formulate in precise terms the truths disclosed in the religious experience of mankind." Those experiences comprise the activity of the will, the heart, and the mind.

The foundations of dogma must be laid in a rational metaphysics which criticizes meanings, and endeavors to express the most general concepts adequate for an all-inclusive universe.

There must be a metaphysical backing, or intense emotion generated in religion will endanger its authority. All religious belief must be criticized in calmness.

It is a delusion that our beliefs can be founded in historical investigation. You can interpret the past only in the terms of the present. History presupposes a metaphysic. The truth applies equally to science or religion which hopes to justify itself without any appeal to metaphysics. To such a metaphysics as may be appealed to, religion may contribute real factors since it is grounded in the metaphysical reality of entities—the self and God.

"A metaphysics is a description," Professor Whitehead reminds us. That which he presents in this volume is too technical and too long for a review. It, as a description, is not itself a necessary part of the claim; rather an attempt at an application of the truth that religion must have recourse to metaphysics for a scrutiny of its terms. One could wish for a simpler description than the author presents—but that is neither here nor there.

SPENSER B. MEESER.

Adventurous Religion. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK. New York: Harper Brothers. 1926. Pp. 326.

THIS is a series of essays under the general caption of the first of the number composing the volume. These have all appeared in current magazines, but a common thread and purpose run through them all, since they are an attempt of a moderate modernist to interpret some of the great truths of Christianity. They are in Doctor Fosdick's clear and engaging style, and set forth the author's well-known views, that because of new knowledge from science, a new apologetic is necessary; indeed that a new religious reformation is at the doors. Both the meaning of present-day liberalistic movements and their dangers, are discussed. The familiar distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion about Jesus is strongly drawn; the writer urging that the religion of Jesus be taken seriously, and that faith, as an adventurous going forward, be no longer obscured by too great emphasis upon the faith as a body of once-formulated doctrines.

One of the greatest hours in Christian history will have struck when once more the religion of Jesus takes the center of the scene.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Recollections and Reflections. NEWMAN SMYTH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926. Pp. 244. Price, $2.00.

IT was the reviewer's privilege many times during his student days to be thrown into the company of this distinguished preacher and thinker, Doctor Newman Smyth. This volume before us, therefore, has been read with more than usual interest. It was his last piece of literary work—completed a few days before his death. It begins with the recollections of a child, in a typical New England home of culture and religion, passes through the days of academy and college, then, of army life in the trying days of civil war, student life at Andover Theological Seminary, and early ministry. The famous "Andover Controversy," in which he and his brother Professor Egbert G. Smyth were storm-centers, is recounted. His New Haven pastorate, during which through mouth and pen he led in the progressive movement in theology and in the application of the gospel to social conditions, is set forth with some detail. In the later years of his active life, his efforts for Christian and church unity made him among the pioneers and leaders.

Three memorial addresses delivered at Center Church, New Haven, where the greater part of his distinguished ministry was spent, close the volume. As Doctor Smyth passed away only a few days after penning the lines with which "the recollections and reflections" close, they are fitly quoted, as characteristic of the man and minister:

> The contrast with the sermons of today is of interest to an older minister not only because reflecting the changes, which, perhaps more imperceptibly than he is aware, have taken place in his own mental attitude on his real growth in faith, but also because it shows what notable changes have taken place in his congregations, and what the poeple have looked for from their pastors. Some of his old sermons might possibly keep his present congregation awake because of their novelty and fire, but the old controversies and the theological terms would convey to most of them little meaning or reality. And yet, though he and his people have been through these changes—however much has changed—running through them all is the same leading of the Spirit, the fulfilment of Jesus' promise to his disciples that his Spirit would lead them into all truth.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Sectarian Shackles. LIBBIE M. TRAVERS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 149.

A BRIGHTLY written narrative of how one woman found "the old-time religion" not good enough for her. Brought up in the narrow, but very intense, faith of Middle West "Campbellism" of a generation ago, the author tells of her emancipation in interesting fashion, and of the joy she felt when she found

that truth is as wide as the Universe, and that no man, nor set of men, ever could or should drive down a peg and say that all ages, tribes, and tongues must come to it.

The book is an autobiographical plea for tolerance, and for the willingness to find and appropriate whatever may be true in the religion of those with whom one differs.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

A Faith for the New Generation. JAMES GORDON GILKEY. New York: Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 169.

THE minister of the South Congregational Church of Springfield, Massachusetts, undertakes to interpret some of the basic Christian truths in a way intelligible to a generation of young people trained to think in terms of natural law. A growing number of college men and women are puzzled, and the Bible assumes just what they wish to have demonstrated. Hence the need of such aid as this little volume attempts to hold out. After diagnosing the case as it appears, five chapters follow on "A Modern Conception of God," "Getting God's Help in Daily Life," "Can We Still Believe in Immortality," "The World's Debt to Jesus," and "The Opportunity of the Modern Church."

Ministers who find their educated young people confused upon the question as to what sort of universe it is in which we live, may receive suggestions as to the best way of dealing with their doubts. Many of the illustrations are quite apposite.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The New Man and the Divine Society. RICHARD ROBERTS. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. 212.

THIS is Volume I of "A Study in Christianity" by the able, scholarly minister of Montreal. It consists of four parts—"Man and His Society," "The New Man and the New Society," "The Great Misadventure," and "The Church in the World"—each of which is treated in six or more sections. The substance of these was given as the Southworth Lectures in the Theological School of Harvard.

The lecturer indicates his general attitude in the first sentence, "The world is evidently biocentric." He thinks mechanistic biology is here to stay, but that it must not be permitted to assert jurisdiction over other fields, especially that of religion. "Religion is an organic part of the life process," but cannot be explained in terms of biological mechanism.

Part I is an interpretation of Man and of Society in terms of biological evolution. Part II is an effort to present the Pauline doctrine of the spiritual man and of the church in terms of modern thought. Part III

is a brilliant portrayal of the Church's medieval "misadventure," of undertaking to capture the world by conformity on the one hand, and by force on the other. Part IV gives a constructive view of the relation of the church to the world. The church is not the kingdom of God, it is the organ and instrument of the kingdom. The kingdom is an organ of life and not an institution. The church is concerned with life as a whole; it must therefore recognize the principle of cooperation and partnership. Its first business, however, is to bring the experience of spiritual renewal to men.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Book of Life. Arranged and edited by NEWTON MARSHALL HALL, D. D., and IRVING FRANCIS WOOD, D. D. Chicago: John Rudin & Company, Inc. Copyright, 1923. Eight volumes. Special price to libraries: Buckram, $37.75; Royal Art binding, $49.75; Leather, $62.75.

THE Book of Life is a work for the home and for libraries that aim to interest parents, teachers and pastors of churches in books which may be used by them through the home, the school, and the church for religious education. This appears at once when the characteristics of these volumes are noticed.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the work is the illustrations. These in addition to their abundance are of unusual variety and selected for two important purposes. One of these purposes is to bring before the reader illustrations of child life which appeal directly to the child through their simplicity; the other is to make large use of reproductions of classic art which reveal the noblest conceptions of the life of the Bible and its interpreters through the centuries.

One is impressed also with the admirable work of the printer in the selection of type and the free paragraphing which together at once attract and encourage the reader, whether young or older. In the quotations from the Bible, of which the work largely consists, some would have preferred the use of the Revised version instead of the Authorized. Others will welcome the well-known version of the ordinary Bible which the authors have chosen. This choice commends itself the more fully because the familiar version has become recognized as a work of literary art and lends itself suitably to the artistic elements of the Book of Life as a whole.

In general the volumes are well calculated to encourage and develop appreciation of history, of literature, of art, and of religion as elements in religious education. They are well supplied with explanatory material of various kinds. There is, for example, a reproduction of the Moabite Stone (vol. 3, p. 378) accompanied with a good translation of this notable historical record. As illustrating the eminent persons whose lives are made

to contribute to the work, there is (vol. 5, p. 284-5) a translation of the Canticle to the Sun, written by Francis of Assisi, which Francis composed as an outgrowth of his study of some of the Psalms, and the authors of the Book of Life have used to illustrate the historical and literary interpretation of the Psalms.

The work is to be commended also in that it includes portions of the Apocrypha such as the books of Maccabees, which are valuable for historical completeness and at the same time lend themselves readily for the artistic objects which the authors of the Book of Life have steadily kept in view.

The first five volumes are largely devoted to the Old Testament, but one should emphasize that volume one is designed particularly to appeal to children as soon as they are old enough to be introduced into the experience of religious training through the aid of parents and teachers. Volume six sketches the life of Jesus from the material supplied in the Gospels, making use of the finest examples of art as a means of bringing the personality and career of Jesus before the reader. In volume seven there is a similar sketch of the life and service of Paul. Volume eight continues the art characteristics and brings together a wide variety of suggestions for the use of the Bible in the home and the school, including examples of prayers and other forms of devotional exercises. In this volume there are also outline courses of study, an extended collection of quotations from the great writers illustrating their use of the Bible, together with a vocabulary showing the pronunciation of Bible names, an explanation of obsolete Bible words and phrases, and an index to Biblical passages as well as a general index of subjects for the work as a whole.

The more one examines these volumes the more he is likely to be impressed with the feeling that the books, when used as intended, by parents, teachers, and pastors, must steadily contribute to a fuller appreciation of the Bible, of literature, and especially of art, as basic elements in religious understanding and appreciation. Readers will do well at least to secure from the library a volume at a time of this work and discover for themselves whether it is a useful tool for cultivating religious character.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century. ROBERT H. MURRAY, Litt. D., with an Introduction by SIR OLIVER LODGE. London: The Sheldon Press. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. 450.

HERE we have a volume full of interesting information concerning the personal lives and the achievements of some of the greatest of Nineteenth

Century Scientists. Jenner and Vaccination, Simpson and Chloroform, Lyell and Uniformitarianism, Helmholtz, Joule and the Conservation of Energy, The Precursors of Darwin, Darwin and Evolution, Pasteur and Microbes, Lister and Antiseptics, Forgotten Scientists, Limitations of Scientists—these ten chapters compose the body of the book. A wealth of bibliography, and an ample index adds to the value of the volume.

An adequate review of a large volume that covers so wide and diverse a range of topics is quite impossible here. It may be sufficient to say there is not a dull page in it. At times it may seem rather too reminiscent and chatty, and yet the intimate familiarity the author shows with the personal traits, and even the foibles of some of the great men who have rather recently passed from the active scenes of their labors, is illuminating and refreshing. The arduous labors, and self-sacrificing devotion of men of science to the task of discovering facts of nature and indicating their possible value to human welfare and progress cannot be eclipsed by the petty prejudices they sometimes showed toward the discoveries of their fellow scientists. Men of science have not always quickly and heartily embraced the new light. The book is highly entertaining and instructive.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Oldest Christian People. G. M. LAMSA and W. C. EMHARDT. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 141.

THIS instructive and interesting volume aims to give "a brief account of the history and traditions of the Assyrian people and the fateful history of the Nestorian Church." The story is racily told. The bibliography appended at the close enables the reader to secure information which the brevity of the narrative made it impossible for the authors to give.

The volume is particularly interesting because of the present status of the Assyrians since 1918. A brief chapter entitled the "Final Settlement" hints the real situation between the British Government and the Turkish Republic. Boundary disputes and oil interests have had fateful consequences for natives who know not the existence of individuals called "diplomats."

The motives actuating the issue of this volume are not those that will figure largely before the Council of the League of Nations.

The interest of George M. Lamsa is that of race and religion. He writes sympathetically because he is a native of Kurdistan and tribes of the Assyrians are his blood-kin. He was educated in the English College at Urmia, Persia, and in the Episcopal Seminary at Alexandria, Virginia. "He has lived with his people in Europe, and in North and South Amer-

ica." He is now Field Representative of the American Branch of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission.

The interest of W. C. Emhardt is philanthropic and religious. He is an American who for more than twenty-five years has had special solicitude for Nestorian Christians, and is now Secretary for Europe and Near East of the National Council of the Episcopal Church. In consequence of a report made by him to the National Council the Episcopal Church in America has sent a priest and a layman as the nucleus of an American unit in the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrians.

The Episcopal Church has for some years been interested in preserving the ancient Nestorian Church, not only for historical reasons, but because it is strategically placed and traditionally endowed for an important mission in the Near East.

> Semitic in its origin and traditions, approaching the Persian with an understanding born of close association for millenniums, almost indigenous in India, and filled with a missionary spirit, favored by special recognition by the Prophet Mohammed, this little church seems the natural organization for producing prophets to the Mohammedan world.

Naturally the book is an appeal for sympathy and aid in preserving and revitalizing the church which owes its name to the eloquent and scholarly and intrepid Nestorius, whose career is one of the pathetically tragic incidents of history. The appeal is effective because based on a vivid presentation of facts of experience of brave common folk who loved and suffered and died for ideals made sacred by Christian associations.

Just as naturally, too, the appeal of the book is to an Episcopal constituency. Chapter X is a rapid narrative of the advents of the Western missions to the East. It discloses the disintegrating processes of Roman and Protestant missions of different denominations. "No one can fail to see that by the introduction of so many creeds into the East the solid unity which made these rigorous Christians so valiant in maintaining their faith is broken, and the racial solidarity weakened." To remedy the evils and to purify the ancient Nestorian faith by infusion of modern Christian ideals and practises, the authors see success only through the policy taken jointly by the mission of the Church of England and American Episcopalians.

The volume well repays reading. It will excite curiosity and stimulate inquiry.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Luther Burbank—His Religion of Humanity. Frederick W. Clampett. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 144.

Scientists may well have religious experience, and assert the right to speak out concerning it. Generally, however, the statements or beliefs of scientific experts as to religion are more interesting than important. One who is an authority in either of these fields does not necessarily qualify as an expert in the other. While few scientists are "orthodox Christians," many of them are Christians in attitude, in love, in service, in character. Luther Burbank's religion is interpreted here as a "religion of humanity." The author of the volume is described by Dr. David Starr Jordan, who pens the Introductory Note, as a liberal representative of the Protestant Episcopal Church. One who reads this little volume will surely have a higher respect for Luther Burbank's religious convictions than one has possibly secured from some cub reporter's sensational account of them. But a man whose lifelong work is in plant life will have his limitations when discussing the life eternal.

Edward B. Pollard.

Church Administration. William H. Leach. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926. Pp. 302.

The modern church has moved a long distance from the simple historic ministry of preaching and visiting. Finance, education, confessional, publicity, and many diverse interests concern its conscience. A new appreciation of the forces constituting the architects of the soul and a direct recognition of the social obligations of the church to a radically changing American culture, lay strange and heavy burdens upon the clergy. The fittest churchmen will survive the current ecclesiastical revolution. The advocates of the simple service of yesterday will be lost eventually in the growing necessity for full-orbed religious program pitched to serve the motley needs of human souls. The best-trained men with deepest social understanding must lead the Kingdom enterprise. The priest will imitate and pass away; the prophet will adventure and abide.

To one phase of this task, Mr. Leach addresses himself in his book, "Church Administration." His is not a philosophy of modern churchmanship. The time is hardly ripe for that ambitious undertaking. He does not even venture to affirm what he conceives to be the functions of the twentieth-century church. If the text has any weakness, it is that no comprehensive purpose underlies the splendid aggregation of church methods. The author chooses to spread out in panoramic view the several types of human service that progressive churches are rendering today, and to illustrate from representative parish programs the techniques

whereby children, youth, and adults are served. Mr. Leach has taken advantage of his experience in the editorial office of *Church Management* to gather wide ranges of materials demonstrative of successful ministry. He sets forth his subject-matter in shop-talk style. The text makes an excellent consulting cyclopedia for busy men.

The book is for consultation rather than dictation purposes. Many of the projects described, which proved so very successful in certain parishes, would prove misfits in other situations. Special personalities, socially defined churches, and particular types of church plants, lend limitation as well as opportunity in choice of activity. For instance, the work of Dr. W. L. Stidger (page 100) could not possibly be duplicated by Dr. A. W. Beaven (page 166). The Brick Presbyterian Church in New York (page 57) would not think of following a scheme of work similar to that in First Congregational Church, Waterloo, Iowa (page 238), and vice versa. Down-town churches serve a different kind of constituency from small-town churches. Men placing major emphasis upon preaching devices cannot always accommodate themselves to the community program emphasis of their neighbor colleagues. The value of any project Mr. Leach proposes lies in its usability in a particular parish. There is suggestion in this manual for all. Here men will discover a rich source of materials rather than a fixed order of activity for their people. To whet the interest of readers, the writer mentions the series of " tested programs for Sunday evenings " treated in chapter five: the question box, the song sermon, echo singing, the art night service, drama and drama singing, the forum, book sermons, a victrola evening. In an appendix to this chapter the author tells the successful methods of " the church that was cursed."

STEWART G. COLE.

Baptist City Planning. CHARLES H. SEARS, Editor. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1926. Pp. 277. Price, $1.00.

CHURCHMANSHIP in the American city is a hazardous undertaking today. It is becoming increasingly difficult to make city churches " go," particularly metropolitan churches. The new wine of human interests will not work in the old order of ecclesiastical program. The expansive desires of urban people necessitate correspondingly inclusive religious enterprises. Nothing short of " the redemption of the city " is moving the minds of men to concerted rethinking of Kingdom business.

The Baptist denomination, through the medium of " The City Plan Committee," has accepted its obligation and lent itself to a worthy policy in the report published under the caption, " Baptist City Planning." The

structure of the book is really fourfold: The city planning view-point, types of city communities, consequent Christian aims, and ways and means to carry out denominational responsibility in urban society. The plan employed in the *St. Louis Church Survey* is copied rather closely. The production of each of the fifteen chapters was committed to a group of men and women qualified for their mission. For this reason, there is diversity of emphasis and considerable overlapping of subject-matter throughout the work. The general thesis of the volume may be summed up in the following words (p. 227):

> Just as the city needs a City Plan Commission to forecast its growth and outline a plan for its future, so in our Baptist city life we have great need of a thoughtful group of Baptist statesmen in each community who will attempt to think their way into the future and map out the plans along which Baptists propose to work if they are to meet the need of that community.

Unfortunately the writers in chapter after chapter thought it necessary to preface their excellent investigations and recommendations by apologetically setting forth the legitimacy of the social approach to Baptist urban work. "Musts" and "shoulds" preponderate on some pages. In as far as the authors picture the stuff out of which human life is constituted in "down-town," "polyglot," "newer residential," "Negro," and other communities, their work is exceedingly helpful. They suggest the variety of Christian appeal and church method obligatory upon those who would work most effectively to conserve or redeem the values of human life. The first three chapters that treat of city planning enunciate principles of much import. They will present to many a fresh and common-sense approach to religious strategy. The weakest chapters are ten, eleven, and twelve, dealing with evangelism, religious education, and social service. The first one lacks practical objective; the second is lost in mechanics of church committee and department, without ever a word of orientation in the child world or an appreciation of personality development in the Christian graces; the third stops short with "definition of terms" and outlines of policy. Where case-study materials abound, as they do (chapters 5 to 9), highly important subject-matter faces churchmen. This book would bear careful reading on the part of every Baptist. Many novel and urgent notes are struck in social Christianity.

STEWART G. COLE.

Motives and Methods in Modern Evangelism. CHARLES L. GOODELL. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1926. Pp. 185.

FEW living preachers in America have won so enviable a place in the work of evangelism as has Doctor Goodell, now Executive Secretary, Commis-

sion on Evangelism and Life Service of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. By voice and pen, he has made his impress upon the Christian church of today by his evangelistic passion. His "Personal and Pastoral Evangelism" has had wide reading. The present volume stresses the same principles and methods in the earlier volume—but out of a still richer experience.

It is interesting to note that many of the recent books on evangelism are either apologetic toward the older methods of mass evangelism, or discard them altogether. At any rate, the emphasis has shifted to the more normal and more permanent methods, through individual effort, and the regular channels of church life. Such chapters as those on "Unconscious Evangelism," "Evangelism and the Modern Mind," "Evangelism and the Student Mind," "Home Evangelism," "Visitation Evangelism," "Week-End Evangelism," "Outdoor Evangelism," "Revival Evangelism," "The Constituency Roll," "Men's Evangelistic Clubs," etc., will disclose some of the newer emphases in this volume.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Great Southern Preaching. Edited by CHARLES M. CROWE, with an Invocation by JOSEPH FORT NEWTON. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 280.

From Feet to Fathoms. REVEREND ROBERT G. LEE. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1926. Pp. 279.

Growing a Soul. MATTHEW T. ANDREWS, D. D. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1926. Pp. 143.

HERE we have a variety of subjects discussed by ministers from a section of the land where preaching is highly prized, and where at its best, is of high order. In the first collection twenty-two preachers speak upon as many themes; in the second, a single preacher gives us ten of his selected sermons. In "Great Southern Preaching" there are sermons from such well-known Southern leaders as Bishops Gailor and Moore of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; Doctors M. Ashby Jones, George W. McDaniel, E. Y. Mullins, and George W. Truett, of the Baptists; Harris E. Kirk and James I. Vance, of the Southern Presbyterian Church; Burris A. Jenkins and E. L. Powell, of the Christian Church; Bishop Partridge, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and others. Several of those whose sermons are here included, however, could hardly be classed as Southern preachers; as for example, Dr. R. A. Torrey, though he has a home in Asheville, N. C., and W. L. Stidger, who has recently moved from the North to Kansas City, Mo. The sermons, as a whole, are well selected and helpful.

Doctor Lee, pastor of the Citadel Square Baptist Church, Charleston, S. C., is successor to a long line of able preachers, who have made that pulpit a rather famous one. He seems to be a worthy successor to those who have gone before. There is not a dull sermon among the ten that compose the volume.

"Growing a Soul" is a small volume of fourteen good sermons preached by the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Texarkana, Texas. The messages come from an earnest heart and a bright, well-stored mind; and if their delivery was as well done as their preparation, they must have had an effect which pleased and profited.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

What to Preach. HENRY SLOANE COFFIN. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1926. Pp. 189.

The English of the Pulpit. LEWIS H. CRISMAN, A. M., Litt. D. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1926. Pp. 155.

DOCTOR COFFIN, as pastor in New York City for many years, and as Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Union Theological Seminary (lately made also President of the Faculty of that institution), has well earned a reputation as preacher and teacher of preachers. This latest volume comprises the Warrack lectures for 1926, at New College, Edinburgh. He is the first American to deliver lectures upon that foundation. The name of the volume may be at first misleading. It does not refer so much to the subject-matter of preaching, as to the various types of sermon which a well-rounded preacher may be called upon to give to his people. Those treated are five in number: Expository Preaching, Doctrinal Preaching, Ethical Preaching, Pastoral Preaching, and Evangelistic Preaching. These topics are all handled with the cultured style and ample learning of the distinguished author.

The volume of Professor Crisman undertakes "to apply the principles of English composition to the specific linguistic problems of the preacher." It does even more than this—it makes many valuable suggestions to those who would perfect themselves in preaching and in public prayer. Students who are conscious of the lack of early training in correct and forceful English, will find this book of much value.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Brightening Cloud. RUSSELL H. CONWELL. Reprinted 1926. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. Pp. 56.

No one who heard Dr. Russell H. Conwell read the ninth chapter of John could soon forget the impression made by his rendering of this striking

New Testament passage. With rare insight and vivid imagination the characters in the story of the opening of the eyes of the man born blind were made to live again in the minds of the hearers. The blind beggar feeling his way to the Pool of Siloam, the haughty council determined to discredit the work of Jesus, the agitated parents torn between joy and fear, the calm figure of the Master, healing, seeking, warning, became real under the spell of the preacher's power.

In 1892 this exposition was published in book form under the title "Little Bo." It has long been out of print, and is now reissued under a new title. Written in Doctor Conwell's most effective style, it has a vividness and charm which make it delightful reading.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

Stars of the Morning. HOWARD KING WILLIAMS, D. D. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1926.

IN this delightful and original book the eyes of the reader are directed to stars of the first magnitude, noteworthy not merely for their brightness, but because each one of them heralded a new day. The man and the occasion met and humanity moved a step forward and upward. With rare skill this preacher-author recreates the atmosphere of the very persons and times with which he is dealing. First delivered to crowded Sunday evening congregations, these biographical sketches bring with them to the printed page the vividness of the spoken word. The characters studied are Dante, Wycliffe, Huss, Savonarola, William the Silent, Shakespeare, Milton, Williams, Wesley, Carey. The opening chapter is devoted to Jesus, the Day Star, and the final one to the Unsung Stars, without which the firmament would be robbed of the greater part of its beauty. The book is a good example of the effective use of biographical material in bringing to bear upon the present hour the spiritual forces generated in the past.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

Concerning the Inner Life. EVELYN UNDERHILL. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1926. Pp. xii, 122.

THIS attractive handbook is designed specially for ministers. The authoress, a student of religion from the mystical side, counsels the clergy of England—though what she says is applicable to ministers everywhere—concerning their personal life in the Spirit. In these days when administrative details and social service activities tend to take an ever larger place in the minister's daily rounds of duty, such a book on the devotional life is

timely. Among the many valuable things suggested by Miss Underhill is the somewhat novel one that the preacher spend a part of his devotional period in the church edifice, where he is to be the leader of worship on the Lord's day, that he may become familiar with the very atmosphere of the place of prayer, and by his example make his church homely and lovable for those who may slip in for tranquil meditation and prayer. More American churches should be thus open during the week; and more American preachers give more careful heed to the culture of their devotional life. Such a book as this may assist.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Bible Dramas in the Pulpit. PERRY J. STACKHOUSE. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1926. Pp. 153.

VERY different in method is this volume from the ones just reviewed. The latter represents the old-fashioned sermon form, but this is a collection of new-fashioned drama sermons by the minister of the First Baptist Church, Chicago. The real effectiveness of such sermons depends so largely upon the delivery, that it is difficult to pass adequate judgment upon this collection. The subjects seem well selected. The Bible furnishes much material available for this sort of discourse. Joseph, Esther, Nicodemus, Zaccheus, the Rich Young Ruler, Judas, and Thomas are persons whom these dramatic scenes depict. They are drawn with discernment, but the stately Oriental style that characterizes some of them, though giving a certain verisimilitude, yet renders them somewhat dignified and slow-moving, one would think, for most Occidental audiences. Those who wish to study this method of presenting religious truth will find in this collection of Doctor Stackhouse valuable suggestion.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Minister and His Music. C. HAROLD LOWDEN. Philadelphia: C. Harold Lowden, Publishers. 1926. Pp. 119.

MR. LOWDEN'S experience in leading church choirs has given birth to a sensible little volume, with an Introduction by the distinguished Southern Presbyterian leader, Dr. James I. Vance. Many valuable suggestions concerning practical church music are given, in rather informal style, upon such important topics as, "What Do You Wish Your Music to Accomplish?" "Selecting Leaders," "Organizing and Maintaining a Volunteer Choir," "Preventing the Choir Fuss," "Musical Insurance—the Junior Choir," "Introducing Novelties," "Ideal Church School Music," etc. Mr. Lowden evidently can see from the minister's angle, as well as from that of the choirmaster.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Bible Object Book. CLARENCE HERBERT WOOLSTON, D. D. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1926. Pp. 263.

THIS is not Doctor Woolston's first attempt to aid others in reaching children through the eye. His "Seeing Truth," "Penny Object Lessons," etc., have had wide circulation. Early in his ministry Pastor Woolston perceived the strategic value of child life in the work of the church, and of the eye as the gateway to the child's soul. For four decades or more he has been shaping his ministry and his church program around these facts. Without technical reference to the psychology of child life, he has used it with success, and many grown men and women now rise up to call him blessed, because he laid hold of them in their impressible years and gave them a start in the upward way.

About sixty illustrations of how one may use common objects to impress spiritual truths are given in this book. Not all of them could be used by everybody as effectively as can Doctor Woolston, but this would hardly be expected. Yet any one who seriously would learn how to illumine the young mind can secure valuable suggestion from this little volume, put out by The American Baptist Publication Society.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

Can We Believe? FRANK M. GOODCHILD, D. D. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1926. Pp. 187.

HERE are twelve chapters that preserve the effective spoken style which characterizes Doctor Goodchild's personal address. The lectures were delivered at different conferences or assemblies and are good examples of Fundamentalism at its best. Doctor Goodchild is perhaps the ablest exponent of the fundamentalist view-point among Northern Baptists. The chapters are full of literary and historical references which, with the virile language of oral address, make the discussions easy and quite pleasant reading. The writer is a master of the short, terse sentence. There is not an obscure passage in the book.

The title of the addresses is "Can We Believe?" So the author gives reasons for believing certain truths that are regarded as fundamental to Christian faith: "Can We Believe in God?" "Can We Believe in the Bible?" "Can We Believe in the Virgin Birth?" "Can We Believe that Jesus Is the Son of God?" "Can We Believe in Miracles?" "Can We Believe in the Atonement?" "Can We Believe in the Resurrection of Christ?" "Can We Believe in Future Punishment?" "Can We Believe in the Lord's Return to the Earth?" These ten questions are of vital concern, though some of them are very much nearer to the foundations than are others. We cannot resist the conviction that some persons

have been honored by an apparent insistence that everything in the Scriptures is of equal necessity as well as of equal value to faith. This harm has come to some young people who find it more difficult to believe in miracles than to believe in God. They may not be very logical, but they need to be held to Christ and the Church. Therefore, we should not make it as difficult to believe in Christ as it may be to believe in his bodily return. It is fair to say that Doctor Goodchild does not go to the extremes found in the writings of some Fundamentalists, and we may venture to assert, some of his chapters will not satisfy many of those who call themselves Fundamentalists. The questions raised by the author are of course all answered in the affirmative and reasons are given for the author's position.

The main issue between Doctor Goodchild and some other Christians, whose position he had doubtless in mind in preparing the addresses, may probably be expressed more accurately by the questions, "*Must* we believe in miracles?" "*Must* we believe in a Bible infallible in science?" "*Must* we believe in a physical return of our Lord to earth?" "*Must* we believe in the so-called substitutionary theory of the atonement?" etc.—in order to be reckoned as Christians? Men *can* believe in many things because they think they have good and sufficient reasons for so doing. Too often proponents of Christian doctrines make their own interpretations of them the only possible one. We would not charge the author with taking this position, and yet here and there a hint of this attitude appears. Perhaps this is due to Doctor Goodchild's commendable quality of personal conviction that one always likes to see in an author as well as in a speaker.

The first chapter is on "The Importance of Belief" and the last, on the "Almightiness of Faith." These are fine expressions of the place of faith in the Christian life, and would be without criticism were there not a too-easy passing from the use of the term faith as a vitalizing force in the personal life, which is the characteristically Scriptural one, to faith, or the faith, as a set of doctrinal beliefs. We need a careful study of the question, What is the relation of doctrinal beliefs to vital faith?

EDWARD B. POLLARD.

The Song of Meditation. ROBERT MACGOWAN. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1926. Pp. 143.

MANY heads of families, who desire to keep alive family devotion, will welcome a help of this sort. It gives a meditation upon some Scripture text, an appropriate poem, and a brief prayer. One may find in it an aid to private devotion, as well as for social home worship. There is an introduction by Professor James H. Snowden.

EDWARD B. POLLARD.